DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 916 EA 023 451

AUTHOR Ernst, Don
TITLE The Context of Policy and Policy Making in Teacher Education. Occasional Paper No. 11.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 118p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; *Politics of Education; *State Action; State Agencies; State Standards; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *State Role

ABSTRACT

Political influences in teacher education policy-making are examined in this paper, which identifies the political players involved and describes current state and national teacher education policy issues and activities. Methodology involved document analysis and interviews with one state education agency staff member from each of the following eight states: California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania. Part 1 describes the current national discourse on teacher education, with a focus on organizations that occupy a special role in teacher education issues. The second part examines the state's role in the regulation of teacher education policy and identifies the players in the politics of certification and program approval. Policy processes and specific issues in each of the eight states are discussed in part 3. Findings indicate that teacher education policy formation is generally characterized by conflict between state control and teacher autonomy, the growth of licensure policies that circumvent teacher preparation programs, lack of state centers for coordinating the policy process, and increasing state control, which stifles creativity and empowerment. (48 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337916

Center for Educational Renewal

THE CONTEXT OF POLICY AND POLICY MAKING
IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Don Ernst
Occasional Paper No. 11
February 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. A. Goodlad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EA 023451

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to many colleagues and mentors who are in one way or another associated with the work, of the Center for Educational Renewal. John Goodlad's wise and patient conceptual advice will always remain one of my important pedagogical privileges. I am grateful for the opportunity to have contributed, if only in a small way, to the important work of the Study of the Education of Educators. Paula McMannon and Joan Waiss were consistent in their kindness and much appreciated encouragement-not to mention their hard work for the cause. I must pay special tribute to my firm but gentle writing mentor, Roger Soder. His clear advice on questions of content, style, and the politics of teacher education in our democracy deserves more recognition than these words can possibly convey. Still, I accept full responsibility for the content of the paper.

THE CONTEXT OF POLICY AND POLICY MAKING IN TEACHER EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I: THE NATIONAL CONTEXT 5

PART II: THE STATE CONTEXT 42

PART III: THE CONTEXT OF TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY MAKING IN EIGHT STATES. 56

- California 56
- Colorado 65
- Georgia 70
- Illinois 75
- Iowa 79
- Massachusetts 84
- Oklahoma 89
- Pennsylvania 93

DISCUSSION. 97

REFERENCES. 103

PREFACE

The state context of policy and policy making in teacher education has changed dramatically in a very short period of time. As recently as two decades ago, schools and colleges of education united closely with state departments of education in determining requirements for initial teaching certificates. The former developed curricula meeting those requirements; the latter accredited preparation programs or evaluated the credentials of graduates on both. Critics complained of a conspiracy between the two. Connivance there may have been from time to time, but the relationship was necessary and convenient. The two groups most involved and held loosely accountable for staffing elementary and secondary schools found that they could conduct their business effectively only by coming together and conversing. This somewhat informed system depended for its functioning largely on mutual trust and respect.

In what follows, Don Ernst presents a much more complex picture. Legislators and governors not only stir the regulatory stew that virtually prescribes the teacher preparatory menu of today, they add to and take away from the ingredients. In some states, the chief state school officer is one of the chefs, but in a growing number he or she is, at most, the cook. The persons in the credentialling office of the state department of education get to print the menus; the dean of education and directors

of teacher education in colleges and universities are privileged to distribute these to faculty members and to students preparing to teach.

One wonders about the directions and desirability of the change. There is an old saw: Education is too important to leave to the educators. How much of it dare we leave to the politicians?

There must be state policies and procedures governing the licensing of teachers as there is in other occupations. Elected and appointed officials have a responsibility for protecting the public in this important domain by setting standards for passing-through the gates to teaching. Ernst describes the key role of professional standards boards in performing this function in several states. But when the gatekeepers also prescribe the routes to the gates, they overstep their appropriate authority and responsibility.

My perspective on what Don Ernst describes is very much conditioned by the comprehensive study of the education of educators conducted by the Center for Educational Renewal over a period of five years--1985 to 1990. My colleagues and I were able to view the impact of much of what Ernst describes on teacher education programs. As a consequence, it is difficult for me to believe that the plus side of the now highly politicized policy making context of teacher education outweighs the negative. A few examples of what we found feed my concern. I am guided in what follows by the assumption that sound policy making in areas of crucial

importance to our welfare stimulates creativity, opens paths to the use of relevant knowledge, and stimulates the kind of healthy competition that drives up quality. Much of what we encountered in the eight states of our sample--those studied by Ernst--suggested quite the opposite in outcomes.

First, we found heads of teacher education in colleges and universities checking off the most recent requirements set by the states against courses now being offered and effecting the necessary changes. Institutions differed in their degree of compliance but within a relatively narrow range. But it was not so much the specific requirements as the facts of their existence and of their relative instability that stifled and ultimately turned off the creative spigot. "Why engage in the hard work of curricular renewal only to have the results dashed by new state requirements?" faculty members asked us over and over. Old-timers, in particular, had been enticed into improvement projects before--often by charismatic deans. They were not about to be sucked in again. (It is interesting to note the use of "enticed" to describe the spirit of entry and "sucked" to denote disillusionment).

Second, the tentacles of the state bureaucracy reach into colleges and universities to influence teacher education curricula to the point of Prescription. Not surprisingly, professors in comprehensive schools and colleges of education gravitate to their disciplines--educational psychology, history, philosophy, sociology,

comparative education, etc.--taught largely at the graduate level and critically free from state intrusions. They prefer to teach and to conduct research in the fields of their own doctorates and to clone doctoral students in them. They are free to redesign the courses and curricula of these fields in accordance with advances reported in journals and professional meetings. The announcements of positions available (in The Chronicle of Higher Education, for example) state the expectations for scholarly work and teaching in, for example, cognition, ethics, or European education, and--oh yes--the introductory course in educational psychology in the teacher education sequence. With acquisition of tenure, associate professors so attracted and subsequently employed frequently move out of teacher education entirely.

The stultifying impact of state intrusion into the curriculum of teacher education does not explain the whole of this subtle transition, of course, but we know that creative people seek in their work domains of greatest freedom from external controls. Where states over-reach their proper authority and their competence--as some are now doing, I fear--our children are the ultimate losers.

Third, for reasonably objective evaluation of the teaching competence of large numbers of beginners to occur, the behavior desired must be accessible to scrutiny over the short period of observation available to the observer. It is virtually essential, then, that this behavior be overt

and relatively simple. Teaching--especially good teaching--is a deeply layered endeavor, as professionals in the business of preparing teachers of young and especially handicapped children well know. Dangerous pitfalls are likely to be encountered, then, by a state seeking to evaluate for certification the entry-year performance of beginning teachers. The complexity and magnitude of the task of developing an appraisal system capable of transcending this danger has been recognized by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards described by Don Ernst. Indeed, such a system does not yet exist.

Yet, undaunted, the state of Georgia plunged into this murky pond. Imagine more than 6000 new teachers undergoing six assessments in fourteen "competency areas" by a team of three evaluators! Our examination revealed the relatively simplistic, technocratic nature of the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument. But this was not the source of our deepest concern. As expected, we found ample evidence of a narrowing of the teacher preparation curriculum and of much repetition in course after course of the care of the TPAI requirements--especially in institutions commonly regarded as the weakest and the most entrepreneurial. Why do more if heavy concentration on this small core is likely to lead to a high percentage of an institution's graduates performing well on the assessments? Under circumstances such as these, competition for students pushes quality down--quality of programs, quality of graduates, and, ultimately, quality of

faculty!

A side-light on Don Ernst's account of policy making in Georgia would be humorous if it were not so disheartening. He reports an interview with a staff person in the state's Office of Certification who told him that all Georgia teacher preparing institutions were responding positively to the TPAI. What poppycock! Or, if not poppycock, what a travesty!

In the six public and private universities visited, we tripped over the TPAI as one trips over a length of cranky plastic hose in one's garden. The descriptive words--elicited from our questions whenever the topic did not otherwise emerge (which was rare)--ranged from "a nuisance" to "outrageous" or "disgraceful." Is the discrepancy between what the staff member said and what we found just one more price of evidence regarding the breakdown in communication and intellectual discourse between those charged with keeping the gates? Or, are there officials in teacher preparing institutions who tell state officials what they think the latter want to hear? (I encountered last year some deans and directors of teacher education in a state's public universities, not in our sample, whose criticism of new policies had brought from a state official reminders of the process of allocating budgets). Or, had this state employee simply convinced herself that the laudable goal of seeking to assure competence among beginning teachers put the means beyond reproach?

This is the question, phrased to be more generally encompassing, that rose reportedly to mind as I went through Don Ernst's report. On balance, this nation is probably better off to have education near the top rather than the bottom of even the rhetorical agenda of President George Bush, governors, state legislators, and business/corporate executives. I am one of those many educators who complained some years ago about quite the reverse situation.

Yet, in teacher education, at least, the various and assorted efforts of segments of the state policy apparatus to effect reform present us with a very mixed picture. For example, the sloganized drive for professional teaching standards appeared to us in some settings to be strengthening the mechanistic emphases in teacher preparation over the moral and ethical. So-called alternative certification arrangements were attracting some older candidates from business and the military who might not have come otherwise but the academic credentials of many of those were years out of date. The time and energy required on the part of teacher educators to adopt curricula to new requirements appeared to be distracting many from the more nebulous but perhaps more professionally sound proposals emanating from the Holmes Group, for example.

There are many instances in Ernst's report of the traditional actors in teacher education being pushed to the sidelines in states' policy making. Just as teacher education is too important to be left to the educators, it

is too important to be left to the politicians. Some of the new actors are beginning to realize that the most obvious levers to pull in seeking to accelerate the pace of reform are not attached to anything capable of movement. They need the help of persons who understand the machinery. Those elected officials who said to the educators a few years ago, "It's time for results," are beginning to realize that this admonition may be directed to them next time.

In the meantime, it behooves us to work together in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect.

We are grateful to the Exxon Education, Mertz-Gilmore, and Southwestern Bell Foundations for support of the Center's work in teacher education.

John I. Goodlad
Professor and Director
Center for Educational Renewal

INTRODUCTION

The Study of the Education of Educators includes inquiry into many substantive issues relating to teacher education. A major focus of the study is on the institutional context of teacher education using a variety of schools, colleges, or departments of education as representative examples in eight states. The purpose of this report is to provide some current descriptive political and contextual information regarding policy making in teacher education.

Not unlike K-12 educational policy making, teacher education policy making is part of the politics of education with many players and groups of players vying for responsibility and control, particularly at the state level. This report deals with these players and their attention (or lack of attention) to issues important to the development of teacher education policy. The report explores current state and national level teacher education policy issues and activities. While some critical issues are addressed at the national level, the states are the forums for most of the policy development and implementation. Licensure of teachers is a state function and teacher licensure/certification coupled with teacher education program approval is at the heart of state responsibility and control. Therefore, the last two sections, which focus on state teacher ducation policy, make up the bulk of the report.

This report does not give an exhaustive description of policy making in teacher education, nor does it attempt a detailed summary and analysis of issues prominent in the teacher education policy domain. It does attempt to provide some contextual information about who has an interest in teacher education policy and the contemporary issues occupying their attention. It is my hope that the descriptive information included in this report will contribute to a better understanding of teacher education policy making and the politics thereof, and will aid the implementation of recommendations emerging from the Study of the Education of Educators.

Methodology

To best understand the complicated and bureaucratic world of teacher education policy development one must be patiently guided by those who know it best. I am grateful to the many people who answered the most basic to the most complicated questions about their role in the development of teacher education policy. Beginning in April of 1989, I identified at least one person in each of eight states in which the institutions that make up the national sample for the Study of the Education of Educators reside (All are cited in the reference section of this report). These individuals are chiefly staff members in the state education agencies responsible for the regulatory control of state program approval of teacher education and teacher certification programs. Their responsibilities also include the

promulgation of rules and regulations governing teacher certification and program approval of teacher education programs. In most instances they are career state bureaucrats with experience as educators. Not only did they provide details of the process of teacher education policy, they willingly provided names of others involved in the process.

In addition, they shared with me relevant documents relating to current issues in teacher education policy in their respective states. Sometimes the people they referred me to held different views on issues and process. They never hesitated to put me in touch with others with different perspectives. These staff members and their offices were useful switching stations for my investigative work. The many telephone interviews with these state agency staff members provided data relating to the development of teacher education policy and those seriously involved in the policy domain. The review of documents they provided also yielded important contextual information. Without this assistance my inquiry would be less complete. Specific telephone interviews are noted in the list of references.

Telephone interviews were conducted also with many staff members and officers of several national education organizations concerned with the teacher education policy domain. These include: the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) the National Board for Professional

Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Holmes Group, and the National Governors' Association. These organizations have been cooperative and helpful. I am grateful for their assistance.

AACTE and NASDTEC publish annually large data books on teacher education policy. AACTE publishes Teacher Education Policy in the States: A 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions. This document summarizes up-to-date legislative and regulative changes in the teacher education policy area for each of the 50 states. The NASDTEC publication, Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States, is a detailed compilation of rules, regulations and laws relating to teacher certification and teacher preparation program approval. It is used by those in state certification offices needing comparative information about other states certification rules and regulations. Both of these data sources provided useful contextual information for this paper. Various staff members of both organizations were always available for answering questions and embellishing data included in their respective data sources. I am particularly grateful to Donald Hair of NASTDEC, and to David Imig of AACTE for their willingness to make available information and staff.

Part I

THE NATIONAL CONTEXT

The current national discourse on teacher education is not easily described. Perhaps this is so because it takes place among loosely coupled groups and organizations that attend to issues relating to the education of teachers and the governance of the teacher education policy domain. Their attention to the issues obviously relates to their own particular interests. In the 1980's, the decade of focus for this report, it is difficult to completely isolate teacher education policy from the backdrop of K-12 education policy reform. This is particularly the case at the national level, with so many groups raising questions and issues important to the education of educators and the subsequent role these educators might play in the reform of K-12 public schools.

Certainly, there are several important national organizations, through their state affiliates, that contribute to this discourse. These organizations range from unions to professional subject area organizations. Several of the organizations have produced reports, studies and recommendations for reform and change of teacher education, certification and national accreditation. Most attempt to stake a claim in the teacher education policy arena.

The descriptive data for this section of this paper come from telephone interviews with staff members of professional organizations, relevant state and organizational documents and specific reform reports. My attention has been directed primarily toward those organizations occupying a special role in the issues of teacher education and this paper is not a detailed review of all education organizations interested in the education of educators.

Tomorrow's Teachers: The Report of the Holmes Group (1986) and A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986), the report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, have been prominently displayed in the popular education press and in major national newspapers such as the New York Times and the Washington Post. Unlike other educational reform documents, the Carnegie and Holmes projects have included some institutionalized follow-up. The Holmes Group is a consortium of research universities continuing to struggle with what it means to be a part of the consortium. The Carnegie Forum's hopes and dreams now ride on the future of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Because of the ongoing efforts of these two organizations, a detailed summary of their current status follows. Also summarized in this section is one other national report, A Call for Change in Teacher Education, the report of the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. This commission was a project of the American Association of Colleges

for Teacher Education, and along with Holmes and Carnegie, occupies a visible place in the national discourse on teacher education. Following the detailed summaries of these "big three" reports are shorter summaries of other reports that have contributed to this national discourse and brief overviews of educational organizations concerned with the policy domain of teacher education in the national context.

Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group

The Holmes Group is a consortium of deans of education and chief academic officers from ninety-six major U.S. research universities. After two years of meetings, discussion and research a report was published. The work of the Holmes Group centers on the five goal areas detailed in the report. It is hoped the research institutions will carry out reforms in the five goal areas.

Goal 1. To make the education of teachers more intellectually solid. This is to be accomplished by (a) developing a graduate professional program in education; (b) linking subject-matter knowledge to teaching; (c) integrating the clinical part of teacher education with research on professional practice.

Goal 2. To recognize differences in knowledge, skill and commitment among teachers. Proposed is a three level structure for the profession that would include a career professional teacher who would assume responsibility at the school level, a

professional teacher who would be fully autonomous in the classroom and an instructor who would teach under a career professional.

Goal 3. To create relevant and defensible standards of entry into the profession of teaching. This would be initiated by requiring students admitted to teacher education to demonstrate basic mastery of writing and speaking and, prior to a clinical internship, pass an examination in the subject they will teach.

Goal 4. To connect schools of education with schools. The idea is to create meaningful partnerships between university faculty and practicing teachers and administrators.

Goal 5. To make schools better places for practicing teachers to work.

The Current Status of Holmes. The work of the Holmes Group differs from other teacher education reform efforts in that it seeks internal institutional change among its members as well as to influence policy and issues external to the institutions. A recent report on the progress of the Holmes Group, Work in Progress: The Holmes Group One Year On, summarizes their work-to-date in seven areas that emerged from summary reports from member institutions:

1. Integrated, Extended Programs. "Across Holmes Group campuses a variety of structures are [sic] taking shape. These include revisions of undergraduate programs, integrated five-year programs, fifth-year programs coordinated with undergraduate education, master's degree programs for liberal arts graduates who wish to enter teaching, and alternate route programs that rely heavily on apprenticeship."

While not supporting any one specific approach, the Holmes Group argues strongly for "integrated and extended" programs of study for prospective teachers. The report One Year On notes some commonalities of such programs:

-- a disciplinary or interdisciplinary undergraduate major for elementary as well as secondary candidates;

-- pre-education courses and experiences typically beginning in the sophomore year;

-- education coursework in the junior and senior years;

-- clinical experiences that may begin in the junior or senior year and extend into a fifth year (One Year On p. 2)

Nonetheless, the report notes a great deal of diversity in approaches to teacher education among the Holmes Institutions. The authors of the report note that this diversity is caused in

some instances by state policy:

"In many locales state policy is also influencing program structure. In a number of states notably Florida, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, Vermont, and Virginia, recent legislative and administrative mandates restrict the number of undergraduate credit hours that can be devoted to education. The intent is to increase a teacher's command of subject matter by requiring a liberal arts degree for certification. In some cases, these new state mandates have been quite compatible with Holmesian principles, while in others they have created difficulty and uncertainty" (One Year On p. 2).

2. Professional Studies Curriculum. "The current political climate emphasizes liberal arts rigor and better supervised and supported clinical experiences and induction, but not professional education studies. Thus, Holmesian program development must identify and organize a body of knowledge about learning and teaching substantial enough to occupy more than a semester of college coursework. Teaching's claim to professionalism and the education's school's claim to a central role in teacher preparation requires such a demonstration" (One Year On p. 5).

"The reports [from member institutions] provide evidence of major conceptual work underway on many campuses:"

-- development of new courses within a professional studies sequence about learning, schooling, and

teaching;

-- assignment of students to small, continuing cohorts in which to traverse the education course of study under consistent faculty advisement;

-- 'blocks' of interrelated methods courses;

-- practica in campus laboratories providing video and computer simulation of teaching;

-- early, extended field experiences in combination with 'reflective' seminars;

-- courses, preparing students for the cultural and linguistic diversity of their future students" (One Year On p. 5).

3. Liberal Arts Preparation. In this section of One Year On the problems associated with connecting subject matter knowledge and pedagogy within the teacher education curriculum, are addressed.

"The Holmes call for rigor in the preparation of teachers has been misread in at least two fundamental ways. The first misreading, related to the changing structure of teacher education, is the common notion that rigor simply means the requirement of a fifth year or a master's degree constructed around long-term clinical practice in a realistic setting. The second misreading is the belief that rigor means simply more coursework in the liberal arts--in general education and in

an arts or sciences major leading to a baccalaureate degree. (These two misconceptions are, of course, related--the master's degree is called for as an education studies add-on following a liberal arts bachelor's degree.)" (One Year On p. 8).

At issue here is the problem of collaboration with other discipline areas across the university curriculum. The report suggests that some new forms of collaboration are emerging across Holmes institutions. They include:

> "-- joint advisement of teacher education students by arts-sciences and education faculty in supervising the required final semester research project;
>
> -- reliance on arts and sciences faculty to serve on admissions boards, mentor teams, and other operational committees;
>
> -- faculty restructuring so that teacher education faculty cut across the arts and sciences and education schools; and
>
> -- regular collaboration in designing and teaching courses" (One Year On pp.8-9).

4. Strengthening and Integrating Cinical Experience. The goal in this area is "creating authentic, dynamic field experiences interspersed and aligned with all students' course work, so that

the prospective teacher can engage in a dialectic between theory and practice" (p. 11). One Year On notes that "considerable progress has been made on these aspects [strengthening and integrating clinical experience] of the Holmes Agenda" (p.11). In summary, this means extending "field experience", otherwise known as student teaching. This section of the report also notes that some Holmes institutions have established "professional development schools," and have created teams of educators at both university and K-12 settings. The report acknowledges the difficulty of such recommendations and expresses little progress in the resolution of tensions created by proposals in these areas.

5. Recruiting Minority Students and Faculty. From the report: "A number of institutions have begun developing promising initiatives. First, many universities report the availability of scholarship and loan forgiveness programs established by the state, local or national foundations, the university, or the education school. Financial support is clearly a necessary component of any plan, but a number of institutions are pioneering additional steps, including for example:

-- carrying through on a commitment to hire several minority faculty for each of the next few years;

-- assigning fulltime staff to work on minority recruitment and retention efforts;

-- developing a collaborative project between an urban university and school district to encourage interest in teaching and college attendance among middle school and high school minorities; to provide mentors to interested students; to supply workshops and other activites for these students on campus; to reach out students' parents to involve them in supporting their children's aspirations to attend college and to teach;

-- recruiting minority midcareer changers into teacher education programs, supplying counseling, financial resources, and other forms of support;

-- investing in comprehensive on-campus advising and academic support services for minority students, targeted specially at those preparing to teach;

-- cooperating with local community colleges that enroll minority student to encourage students interested in teaching to transfer to the university, and assist in the community college's curriculum and faculty development;

-- forming partnerships with predominantly black institutions for recruitment to graduate programs for teacher education that include scholarships and assistance; and

-- creating community-based partnerships with business

and civic organizations to supply scholarships and continuing support to high school students with interest in teaching" (One Year On pp.15-16).

6. Teaching and Assessment in Teacher Education. Again, summary from One Year On: "As a consortium of research universities, The Holmes Group has undertaken a special obligation to inform the curriculum of teacher education with steadily accumulating knowledge about teaching and learning. This obligation may take many forms:

-- efforts to synthesize and represent existing knowledge in such materials of instruction as laboratory simulations, written and video teaching cases, course syllabi, program principles and objectives, textbooks, and others;

-- collaborative inquiry with practitioners;

-- targeted programs of research on questions central to teacher education;

-- experiments with new methods of inquiry; and

-- policy and evaluation research related to teacher education" (One Year On pp.19-20).

7. State Policy. "Most reports [from member institutions] alluded to influence on their efforts to change. The Holmes Group is one among a number of contending influences, and many

institutions are struggling to manage change in a turbulent political environment" (p. 17). The report concluded that in this area Holmes policies have been both heeded and totally disregarded. In an interview with Robert Koff, who chairs the Holmes Group's committee on government relations and policy, he noted that currently "the goal is to reformulate the policy process in teacher education" and ask the question, "What should the policy process look like?" (Koff, August 22, 1989). Koff also noted that almost every dean, through his or her own institution, is participating in the policy development process at the state political level.

While both the One Year On report and the Koff interview support the idea that Holmes has been involved in influencing state teacher education policy, interviews with staff in state teacher certification offices in the eight states that are the focus of the Study of the Education of Educators yielded no information to suggest the Holmes Agenda has pushed states to act on the specific recommendations in Tomorrow's Teachers.

The Future of Holmes

The review and summary of Work In Progress: The Holmes Group One Year On , suggest that some consortium members have been attempting to implement the recommendations outlined in Tomorrow's Teachers. Many states are extending the teacher preparation requirements to include a "fifth-year" experience of

some kind. This includes master's degree requirements and an additional year "add-on" to the usual four-year program. Most recently Washington, Oregon, and Iowa have added a "fifth-year." This brings the total of states with such a requirement to eight. It remains to be seen how support for such a "Holmesian" proposal will fare in other states (NASDTEC, 1988).

Finally, Holmes staff member Mary Dean-Barringer reported in September that the Holmes Group leadership is engaged in a strategic planning process to plan the future of the consortium and is preparing another report, Tomorrow's Schools, to be released in January 1990 (Dean-Barringer, 1989).

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: The Legacy of A Nation Prepared: Teachers For the 21st Century.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, the report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, places itself in the tradition of earlier educational reform reports by linking the need for better education to economic success. The report notes, "economic success depends on achieving far more demanding educational standards than we have ever attempted to reach before" and "...in creating a profession equal to the task--a profession of well-educated teachers to assume new powers and responsibilities to redesign schools for the future" (p. 2). What follows is a list of the major recommendations of Teachers for the 21st Century:

1. Create a National Board for Professional Standards to

determine what teachers need to know and be able to do.

2. Restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teaching, giving teachers the power and responsibility to decide how best to meet the needs of children.

3. Restructure the teaching force and introduce "lead teachers" with the ability to help redesign the schools and help their colleagues uphold high standards.

4. Require a bachelor's degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for studying education.

5. Develop a more professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Master in Teaching degree.

6. Mobilize the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.

7. Relate incentives for teachers to student performance.

8. Make teachers' salaries and career opportunities competitive with other professions.

Of the above recommendations in the Carnegie Forum report the one advocating the creation of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has become most significant in the politics of teacher licensure and certification.

As for the purpose of NBPTS. "It is our view that the Board must define what teachers need to know and be able to do. It must support the creation of rigorous, valid assessments to see that certified teachers do meet those standards. We think the Board should work with states to eliminate barriers to a truly

national labor market for teachers. And it must do all of these things in concert with the profession and interested members of the public" (p. 111).

The NBPTS began its work in the fall of 1987. It is composed of a 63-member Board of Directors, 25 consultants, and 10 professional staff (National Board for Professional Standards, President's 1987-88 Annual Report). The Board of Directors consists of teachers at both elementary and secondary levels (a majority of the board members are teachers who are also representatives of the two major teacher's unions--the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers), government officials, educational experts, and business people.

Ongoing research on the "knowledge base" of teaching remains central to the mission of the Board. However, the Board has identified five "core propositions" for the development of national standards during the initial phase of Board operation. They include: (1) teachers who are committed to their students and their learning; (2) subject matter knowledge and how to teach subject matter; (3) managing and monitoring student learning; (4) systematic thinking about practice and experience; and (5) teachers as members of a larger community (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989).

The above propositions form the foundation for a national certification system advocated by the Board. This system is not to replace those state systems currently operating. Rather, it will offer a new "voluntary" credential to experienced teachers

willing to undergo a battery of tests and classroom observations.

The Board has stated its "policy position" on the "prerequisites a candidate shall have for completing the assessment process for National Board Certification: (1) At least, a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution; (2) Complete three years of teaching at one or more elementary or secondary schools" (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989, p. 52).

The National Board proposes a certification process that meets the true meaning of board certification as contrasted with licensure (at the state level, licensure is commonly referred to as certification). Licensure implies that the public is protected from general incompetence. What the NBPTS advocates then is a higher degree of competence based on higher and more rigorous standards. The development of these standards remains as the central challenge of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

The National Board and the States

The National Board is careful to point out that its proposal for national certification is a voluntary process and is not intended to be substituted for state policy on teacher licensure/certification. Nonetheless, there are some implications for state policy.

First, even if the national certification process is voluntary, states must decide how to incorporate the requirements

into their own system of teacher certification. During the last decade the majority of states have passed laws requiring a variety of tests prior to certification. Many states have adopted the National Teacher Examination though with different qualifying scores. Other states have developed their own certification tests. Preventing redundancy and confusion over issues of assessment will not be easy for those states with an interest in the national certification process.

Second, the Carnegie Forum report and the NBPTS have supported the idea of "lead teachers." Many states have struggled with developing their own plans for career ladders, mentor teachers and similiar ideas. The states may find it disruptive to have the National Board superimpose its means of assessment on them.

To date, only two states have taken specific policy action relating to the National Board. The Iowa Legislature, with support from Iowa Governor Terry Branstad, passed legislation in 1988 permitting the certification of Iowa teachers to be based on National Board Standards providing the National Standards exceed the current Iowa state standards. Only one other state, West Virginia, has taken action on the National Board proposals. Also in 1988, the West Virginia Legislature appropriated funds through a general line item in the state education budget to "work with the board" after development of initial National Standards.

Third, it seems an awesome task for one organization to assume responsibility for the assessment of the skills and

abilities of a group that would draw from a membership of over two million individuals. Indeed, the Carnegie Forum has admitted the difficulty of centralized implementation of its plan when it suggests that the final step of certifying must be on a regional or state level (Carnegie Forum, 1986, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989).

The Future of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

If political support from elected politicians and educational organizations was the sole factor used to detemine the failure or success of the National Board one would have to conclude that the Board has succeeded and has a bright future. David Mandel, Vice-President for Policy Development for the National Board has suggested that it is "no accident that state leaders and former state leaders are on the Board of Directors and that the board has sought endorsements from elected politicians" (Mandel, 1989). One current and one former governor serve on the Board of Directors of National Board--James Hunt, former governor of North Carolina and Thomas Kean, governor of New Jersey until January 1990. Kean authored a booklet for the National Governor's Association offering governors advice on how to prepare for advancing the cause of the National Board in their respective states. Kean notes in Getting Ready for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: What a Governor Can Do that "governors supported the National Board for Professional

Teaching Standards in our report, Time for Results, and again in the sequel Results in Education, 1987. Kean adds, "Governors are interested in the national board because we share an interest in teacher standards. Licensing teachers is a fundamental state responsibility and standards are at the heart of it. A teaching license is the state's guarantee to the public that a teacher possesses the basic competence to enter the classroom. We take that seriously" (National Governors' Association, 1988). Finally, Kean argues that "the national board represents a major opportunity for teachers to join with state and local policy makers to set the professional standards for teaching. It represents a major opportunity for the states because it provides both a system to recognize and advance the professional talent of teachers and to better assessment techniques. Governors can help realize these opportunities" (National Governors' Association, 1988). Clearly, the National Governors' Association supports the proposals of the National Board.

Mandel also indicated that the Board has been given formal endorsements from the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Association of State Board's of Education, in addition to the two national teacher associations. He further noted that "in the next year National Board staff will be appearing in front of state policy makers seeking to gain support for the Board's plans" (Mandel, 1989).

The Board has expressed an ongoing interest in the development of teacher policy. "The Board has a keen interest in

how the teacher policy debate progresses, for it will affect how teaching careers are defined and the pool of applicants for Board-certification, and the health of the profession. The Board will work in concert with others, especially with those engaged in issues of teacher education, the reform of instruction in schools, and the recruitment and retention of teachers" (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989, p. 81). The Board has chosen three issues that "will be the major focus of its education policy and reform initiatives over the next five years:

"1. Creating a more effective environment for teaching and learning in schools.

2. Increasing the supply of high quality entrants into the profession, with special emphasis on minorities.

3. Improving teacher education and continuing professional development" (p. 82).

While it is too early to assess the success or failure of the National Board, it is clear that the Board enjoys support from many powerful organizations and politicians, including those at the federal level. Pending before the United States Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources is legislation which would give even more political support to the National Board. Indeed, Senate Bill 2698, "to provide federal assistance to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards", has significant support from a bipartisan group of senators. This group includes liberal Democratic Senators, Pell, Dodd, Kennedy, and Harkin.

The Republican sponsors include Senators Stafford and Hatch. The bill does specify that "the purpose of the Act is to provide financial assistance to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to enable the board to conduct independent research and development related to the establishment of national, voluntary professional standards and assessment methods for the teaching profession" (S. 2698, p. 3). Additionally, the legislation proposes to provide $25 million dollars to this effort. This "federal" appropriation is to be matched with another $25 million "from foundations and corporations" (New York Times, July 18, 1989). The Carnegie Corporation of New York, which established the forum has put up $5 million.

Edward Fiske, the Education Editor of the New York Times, perhaps best summarized the implications of the report for both the states and the institutions historically charged with preparing public school educators when he wrote: "Under the board's plan certification is to be open to any teacher with a bachelor's degree and three years of teaching experience in a public or private school. There is no need to have passed specific education courses or to be licensed by a state. This emphasis on effectiveness is expected to put pressure on university departments and schools of education, which have been portrayed in recent educational reports as intellectual wastelands" (New York Times, July 18, 1989).

And so, even though the board has repeatedly argued that the national system is a voluntary one, the potential for changing

the traditional roles of schools, colleges and departments of education and the states in the preparation and licensure of teachers is real if state education policy makers accept the national process. To what extent these role changes will occur and what form they will take remains to be seen.

A Call for Change in Teacher Education, The Report of the National Commission For Excellence in Teacher Education, The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

This report was the product of a blue ribbon committee created by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). AACTE is the principal national organization providing leadership on issues, ideas and practice relating to the education of teachers. The Association has 725 member institutions and works closely with its forty-six state affiliates. The activities of AACTE focus on governmental relations, policy analysis, and professional development and research (Early, 1989).

The Commission consisted of five deans of SCDEs, four college presidents, AFT and NEA presidents, a governor, a state legislator, a chief state school officer, a member of Congress, and the past president of the National School Boards Association.

The report was funded by the U.S. Department of Education and several foundations including the Ford Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, and the Lily Endowment.

A Call for Change is organized around five themes: (1) Supply and Demand for High Quality Teachers; (2) Programs for

Teacher Education; (3) Accountability for Teacher Education; (4) Resources for Teacher Education; and (5) Conditions Necessary to Support the Highest Quality Teaching. Each of the five themes was followed by specific recommendations. What follows is a brief summary of those recommendations.

(1) Supply and Demand for High Quality Teachers. Recommendations include: (a) Entrance and completion of academic programs for teachers should be based upon vigorous academic and performance standards; (b) The federal and state governments should offer financial incentives for recruitment of teachers and that the states and local boards should adhere to high quality standards in the certification and education of teachers; (c) State and federal governments should ensure that lack of finances will not bar qualified minority students from entering teacher education programs (AACTE, 1984, pp. 8-9).

(2) Programs for Teacher Education. Recommendations: (a) Upgrade the quality of the liberal and professional curricula; (b) Require a one-year internship of "provisional certification," and (c) Experimental models of teacher education programs should be encouraged (pp.11-12).

(3) Accountability for Teacher Education. Recommendations: (a) Certification and Program Approval should continue to be responsibilities of the states; (b) Both state standards for program review and voluntary national accreditation should be increased, and, (c) Teacher education programs should continue to be located in colleges and universities (pp.9-10).

(4) Resources for Teacher education. Recommendations: (a) Sufficient resources must be assigned to teacher education to provide thorough, rigorous programs; (b) Federal and state governments should provide support and encouragement for the further development, dissemination, and use of research information in education and teacher education; (c) A National Academy for Teacher Education should be established, to which promising teacher educators could be nominated for post graduate traineeships.

(5) Conditions to Support the Highest Quality Teaching: (a) Increased salaries for teachers to the level commensurate with other professions requiring comparable training and expertise; (b) Teacher's responsibilities and working conditions should be commensurate with the requirements of the job; (c) Teachers should be provided professional development opportunities and incentives so that they can consistently improve their practice; (d) Administrator preparation should be extended, focusing on instructional leadership and on the creation of conditions for professional practice for teachers (pp. 26-29).

A Call for Change, while suggesting some new approaches to the education of educators, does not recommend a completely new direction in the way teacher education programs operate and in how the states assume responsibility for their governance. The report reaffirms the view that the governance of program approval and teacher certification remain a state function in

collaboration with educators.

AACTE and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

More recently, AACTE has provided leadership in raising questions about policies of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Penelope Early of AACTE suggested that in the debate regarding the role of the National Board, AACTE was the only national organization raising serious questions about: (1) the propriety of federal funding for what is essentially a state process; (2) the disregard of public accountability that Early argues has not been fully discussed or debated--essentially this relates to the important issues of protecting the public versus a national certification process that intends to bypass approved teacher education programs. Early noted that AACTE continues to take the lead in opposing federal support for the National Board.

Early also explained that AACTE is playing a key role, not dissimiliar to the role in opposing the national board, in the opposition of the many proposals at the state level to license teachers without having gone through a professional teacher preparation program. She also explained that this issue is also a public protection issue. She raised the question, "Where is the public trust in programs that disregard the prerequisites necessary for teachers?" (Early, 1989).

Early also noted that another very important national role being played by AACTE is the ongoing effort to "influence the

policy influence networks such as the National Governors' Association, the Education Commission of the States, and the National Conference of State Legislatures" (Early,1989). She indicated that this role has become more important as these policy networks have become more influential in the teacher education policy process.

A Small Sample of Other Recent Reports Relating to Changes in Teacher Preparation

It is not been my intent to cover the history of teacher education reform in the United States. Rather, I have attempted to describe those contemporary voices of reform in the education of educators, particularly as they relate to the politics and regulation of teacher education. While I make no claim that all the voices of change have been described, I do suggest that the above national reports still have life and the potential to influence policy makers who see the preparation of teachers as critical to educational reform in the 1990's. I conclude this section on the teacher education reports with brief descriptions of two more reports calling for reform in teacher education and certification. These are of relatively recent vintage and thus, unlike Holmes, Carnegie and the National Board, have no track record.

"Who Sets the Standards:" An Occasional Paper by the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affliated Private Universities (NASULGC).

The summary of this occasional paper comes from a very brief review in Education Week (December 13, 1989) and from a brief telephone interview with one of its three authors, Dale Anderson, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

This paper stakes a position in support of "independent state teacher standards boards" (Anderson, December 18, 1989). According to Anderson these boards would follow existing boards that currently exist in California, Oregon, and Minnesota and to some degree in Nevada, though the Nevada board is subject to veto by the state board of education.

Independence from what? Essentially, independence as it relates to state teacher standards boards implies that these do not answer to state boards of education and would therefore not be controlled by the general public. This means they would have their own leadership and staff. Indeed, "Who Sets the Standards", calls for the state boards to be made up of a majority of teachers and other educators (teacher educators), and be funded exclusively from licensure fees. Under this proposal, then, the licensure of teachers would switch from the state board bureaucracies (offices of certification, under the auspices of the state education agencies and their directors) to these new licensure agencies.

"The Reform of Teacher Education For the 21st Century"

Also summarized in the December 13, 1989 issue of Education Week is the report, "The Reform of Teacher Education For the 21st Century" that has emerged out of "a year of conversation between representatives of the education schools and colleges of arts and sciences involved in Project 30, which brings together segments of academe that normally have little contact with one another."

A final report will be issued in book form in 1991. The focus of the report is on the question of how to combine pedagogy and the liberal arts and sciences in teacher preparation. Education Week notes that this connection, or lack of it, is the "weakest link" in the education of teachers and requires much greater attention.

Having considered in brief selected national reports, we now turn to an overview of selected national organizations dealing with teacher preparation.

National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

NCATE is a voluntary accreditation agency that conducts reviews of teacher education programs. This review process is done by a team of educators, usually from states other than the one the particular SCDE under review is in. After the review is completed and approved by the NCATE team the teacher preparation program is granted an "accredited" status.

The leadership of NCATE comes from various educational organizations with an interest in the preparation of teachers, including the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Education Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education. Historically, NCATE has been dominated by the NEA. This caused Conant to observe in 1963 that NCATE is a "political arm" of the NEA (Conant, 1963, p. 22). It might now be argued that the influence of NCATE at the state level has declined as evidenced in the decline in the number of state teacher education programs seeking NCATE accreditation. Indeed, NASDTEC reports that the number of states using NCATE has declined. "Only seventeen states now report the use of NCATE standards for program accreditation" (NASDTEC, 1988). Two states in my eight state review, Oklahoma and Illinois, have chosen NCATE standards for their institutional approval process.

Current Status. In May of 1985, a committee appointed by the Council of Chief State School Officers in cooperation with NCATE initiated a process designed to "create a system of national recognition of excellence in approaches to teacher education program approval" (NCATE, 1988, p.1). One committee member suggested that the motivation for this committee's work "was to respond to the many state reform movements" (Hanner, March 1988). Penelope Early, Director of Government Relations at AACTE suggested that another motivation "was to save money and

time and effort associated with the process of gaining both NCATE and state approval" (Early, March 1988).

To respond to this problem of duplicative accreditation, NCATE developed and approved four options for states wanting both national and state program approval. The four options are summarized from the NCATE Redesign Documents:

Option One: State program approval is conducted separately but concurrently and cooperatively with NCATE. Two separate visiting teams must conduct on-site visits to an institution on same dates. One team will represent NCATE using NCATE unit standards. One team will represent the state standards for program approval.

Option Two: Both the NCATE unit and state standards are used during the on site visits. A single team will be selected jointly by NCATE and the state. Each team member will have a vote on both state and NCATE standards.

Option Three: Both state approval and NCATE accreditation are based on NCATE unit standards. On-site visits are conducted by a single team composed of representatives of NCATE and representatives of the state, jointly selected. Each team member will have a vote and NCATE simultaneously.

Option Four: The state accepts NCATE's decision of accreditation for state approval. On-site visits will be organized and conducted by NCATE. Any state desiring NCATE recognition can add other criteria specific to state mandates. When a state chooses not to be recognized by NCATE, teacher

education institutions in that state may obtain NCATE accreditation separately from state approval.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)

"The membership in NASDTEC consists of those agency staff in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the territories and the Overseas Dependent Schools that have major administrative responsibility for the preparation and certification of professional school personnel and/or professional standards and practices" (NASDTEC, 1988, p. vi.).

As noted earlier, NASDTEC publishes a manual that gives a complete state-by-state compilation of certification requirements, teacher education program approval standards and related issues. This constitutes one of three major roles of this organization. The second role is providing "leadership in matters related to the preparation and certification of professional school personnel" (p. iv). The third major role of NASDTEC, alluded to earlier in the report, "is the establishment of a nationwide depository for the collection and dissemination of disciplinary actions (relating to teachers and teacher education programs) taken by each state" (p.vi.).

Interstate Policy Organizations

Wirt and Kirst note that "education is currently a popular arena for legislators because of its size and visibility" (p.284). They also write that "ideas spread rapidly across states through interstate organizations like the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the Education Commission of the States ECS)" (p. 284). I would add at least one more organization to their list--the National Governors' Association (NGA).

While my inquiry has not included detailed examination of the spread of specific policy issues through these organizations, my own personal experience, interview information from state policy staff, and interviews with staff at AACTE suggests the influence of these organizations may indeed be growing. What follows is a brief description of the organizations and some of the issues that they have been attending to relating to teacher education policy.

The National Conference of State Legislatures consists of the members and leaders of the fifty-state legislative bodies. It has a small staff located in Denver and in Washington D.C. While focusing primarily on funding issues in the education policy area, this organizatin has explored other educational issues. According to the Excecutive Director, John L. Myers, it does not take any particular position on issues but, rather, provides research information to member legislators or their

staff on specific requests. They also conduct computer tracking of state legislation so that members can obtain "model legislation" that can be used in other legislative settings. Myers indicated some sharing of alternative certification legislation has occured in addition to some inquiries relating to how legislatures are confronting state collaboration with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (Myers, August, 1989).

The Education Commission of the States, proposed in 1964 by James B. Conant, is a compact between states "in order to cope with the growing complexities of educational problems and issues" (Conant, 1964, pp. 123-24). In 1965, several hundred educators and policy leaders met in Kansas City to ratify such a compact and thus created the Education Commission of the States.

Leadership of the ECS is now made up of seven representatives from each of forty-eight states (two states do not pay ECS dues), and United States Territorities. ECS meets annually to engage a wide range of policy makers, educators, business leaders and other interested citizens in the educational issues occupying center stage for states. Each year ECS elects a new chair from among the nation's governors.

In the last ten years ECS has played an important role in maintaining the focus on educational reform. The current President, Frank Newman, has attempted to center the work of ECS on particular educational reform issues, and on providing necessary forums for debate, discussion, and the dissemination of

relevant information. Newman has championed efforts to form partnerships with business and educational organizations committed to improving American education. Unlike NCSL, ECS has as its constituents a wider range of policy makers and educators. This presents particular problems for the narrowing of focus. Nonetheless, ECS serves and will continue to serve as an important interstate organization for the sharing of educational ideas and policies, and for providing forums for the diverse constituencies of public education to interact.

ECS has provided for many teacher educators and researchers forums on issues relating to teacher education, though it has not developed any particular position on teacher education or on issues in the area of teacher education, such as the National Board. However, because of the relationship it enjoys with the nation's governors and other state-level policy makers ECS will continue to be an important interstate organization in the national context of teacher education.

The National Governors' Association, following the flurry of state reform of K-12 educational systems, defined a five-year agenda for improving education. My intent here is not to detail and evaluate this five-year plan. What I do want to describe, however, is the growing role of governors and, therefore, the NGA, in the policy arenas of educational reform. The five-year plan referred to above was initiated by the 1987 report, The Governors' 1991 Report On Education: Time for Results. This

document, from the nation's governors' perspective, was a report of the progress made in educational reform from 1983-1987. Of particularconcern were issues such as state public accountability policies, how states have dealt with leadership and management issues, teaching and teachers, parent involvement and choice, readiness for school, educational technology, school facilities, and college quality. One governor chaired each of the above noted policy areas. The governors held hearings to hear from the interested public and educational organizations and published the compilation of these hearings as their report.

Subsequent to the 1991 Report has been a series of follow-up reports intending to document progress on the various issues. Several areas have since been added and the NGA continues its five- year focus. Certainly this process is important as individual governors participate in meetings with one another and share ideas and specific policy proposals.

Even more recent, of course, is the November 1989 Education Summit with President Bush. The NGA, along with the Federal Department of Education and White House Staff, is providing staff assistance in the establishment of national educational goals.

Not unlike ECS and NCSL, the NGA now has an educational policy staff providing capacity for more serious attention to promoting the governors' positions on educational issues and on educational issue identification. It is important to understand that the NGA staff has doubled since Governor Lamar Alexander started the five- year plan (Wirt and Kirst, 1989, p. 286).

Included in the 1991 agenda was a recommendation to create " a more highly professional teaching force" (NGA, 1988). This goal is to be manifested in the endorsement of new and additional assessments of performance of teachers and the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

It would appear that it is no accident that NGA supports the work of the Board. Prior to 1983, the NGA primarily relied on the Washington staff of the ECS for policy research and technical assistance. Currently the NGA staff, officially known as the NGA Center for Policy Research, has twelve people, supported by funds from the Carnegie Corporation of New York--the same funding source for the initial work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Indeed, Carnegie provided the funding for Governor Kean's monograph for his fellow governors on how to prepare for the coming of the National Board. Susan Traiman, one member of the NGA policy staff, and formerly a member of the A Nation At Risk project, suggested that this "intellectual cross-fertilization" is occuring since it is consistent with the "new activism" of governors in the development of educational policy, specifically in the

"professionalization" of teaching. She also proposed that governors have "no diminishing interest" in making policy to improve education, including the education and licensure of teachers (Traiman, May, 1989).

PART II

THE STATE CONTEXT

What follows in this section is a general introduction to the state role in the control and regulation of the teacher education policy domain. It is my hope that such a description will help to answer the questions: Why does it take so long to make teacher education policy?; and Who is involved in the process? Before moving on to a description of the general role of the states and then, specifically, in the teacher education policy domain, I will describe the basis upon which states derive their responsibilities for the control and regulation of teacher preparation.

Licensure/Certification and Program Approval

All students of American government have had explained to them at one time or another the significance of the tenth amendment--which provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." No better illustration is there of the tenth amendment in practice than in the regulation, control, and fiscal responsibility of the states over education systems--including the policy domain of teacher education.

Licensure

Over the last one hundred years, states have moved to control the preparation and licensure of teachers (Wirt and Kirst, 1989, p.256). Licensure is often described by state bureaucracies as "certification," though a teacher certificate is a license to teach. Teacher certification then is defined as the state giving legal sanction to teach at particular grade levels and in certain subject areas.

The 1980's, perhaps, will be viewed in the future as one of the significant periods in the growth of state control and regulation in all facets of education. The 1980's have witnessed "well over 1000 pieces of state legislation" relating to teacher policy, including teacher education (Darling-Hammond and Berry, p. 69, 1988). These pieces of legislation have created additional regulations, (including testing requirements), for entry into teacher education programs continuing licensure programs mandating supervision of beginning teachers and the development of career ladders or different levels of licensure. In my review of states, primarily done through telephone interviews and in reviewing relevant data sources, I have moved close to the position that Darling-Hammond and Berry state in their monograph The Evolution of Teacher Policy--that most of the changes have been promulgated by state legislatures and state education agencies (p. 69). Three states (California, Oregon and Minnesota) have created state standards boards that are independent of other state education agencies. Nonetheless,

rarely do these rules and regulations represent "a consensual view either within the profession or across states of what a teacher ought to know or be able to do" (Darling-Hammond and Berry, p. 69). Nonetheless, the states still view their role as primary in the licensure/certification of teachers and the states have lived up to this role by steadily increasing standards for initial certification.

Why have the states become so concerned with increased standards in the licensing of teachers? In my many interviews with those in state education agencies responsible for the certification of teachers at least one theme emerged as an answer to this question. While there are many variations of the theme, all certification staff in the states agreed that their role was to ensure that it was their responsibility to protect the public from incompetence and harm. Most of this protection was in response to bad practice or bad academic performance, though several states now have policies that require screening would-be teachers for histories of crime and child abuse. Indeed, in 1987 the National Association of State Directors for Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) created a national clearinghouse, to be used by all fifty states, to house the names of all teacher certification applicants who have been refused certification or who have had their licenses revoked. It is too early in this project to determine how successful this project will be (Hair, 1988). I do believe, however, it gives weight to the view that the state serves as protectors of the public in the screening of

teacher prospects.

Teacher Education Program Approval: Provenance of the States

Each of the fifty states either develops or adopts standards which teacher education programs in colleges or universities must meet before their graduates can be issued teaching certificates. Program approval serves as the foundation for state control of the teacher policy domain--including certification/licensure.

If institutions want their graduates to be licensed as teachers, then program approval becomes a mandatory process. The process generally includes a period of self-study by the institutions seeking approval that is then followed up by a visiting team of teacher educators from other teacher preparing institutions and, usually, the schools, and concludes with a review and approval process by the state policy body governing the state educational system. In all but three states this includes the state board of education.

As Conant pointed out almost thirty years ago, there is much that is political in this process. State agencies have much to lose if they are so rigorous in the approval process that institutions fail. This may be one source of apparent displeasure by governors and legislators in the way teacher education conducts itself. That is, it is seen by those highest in the educational policy hierarchy as a time-consuming and largely bureaucratic process taking years to complete.

The Players in the Politics of Certification and Program approval

Certification Staff in State Agencies served as key contacts in my inquiry. They function as switching stations to others involved in the teacher education policy development process and their offices are really the hubs of activity in the development of teacher education policy. Many educators characterize them as functionaries or bureaucrats serving only the interest of their particular state education agency and easily forced to enact rules and regulations coming from outside their spheres of responsibilities.

What do they do and how do they perceive their responsibilities? Primarily, they see themselves as keepers of the knowledge relating to the specifics of certification and program approval requirements. They provide this information daily to prospective teachers and teacher educators who are responsible for directing teacher candidates. They maintain regular contact with deans of SCDEs and other teacher educators. They are the authors of the rules and regulations and come to be important resources for those with questions relating to these rules and regulations. They also serve as key resources for legislative and gubernatorial staffs, as well as for their own state agency staff, including the chief state school officer. In my interviews of the staff in eight states making up the Study of the Education of Educators, all the staff in these certification offices believed they were influential in the development of policy. When asked what their most important role was they

uniformly responded that it was to ensure that the children of their respective states were at least minimally protected against teachers who might be unfit to teach--based on minimum teacher certification requirements and SCDE program approval standards.

Most of these staff people hold advanced degrees and have been at one time or another involved in K-12 education. In short, these people seem to be the glue for the states' role in the teacher policy arena. My own personal experience suggests that if a spirit of trust and cooperation develops between and among members of this policy making community the key is the person(s) in the teacher certification offices. Perhaps, it is time politicians and others acknowledge the moral responsibility these people have in protecting the public from those who should not be in classrooms as teachers and in their role of ensuring a minumum level of expertise.

Teacher educators and others representing colleges of education primarily attempt to influence policy by serving on advisory boards, providing testimony and research information at both state board of education meetings and to legislative committee hearings. Organizations representing SCDEs expressed a much greater sense of success than did certification staff members who ranked them behind teachers unions (interviews with certification staff officials).

The organized state teachers unions/organizations play a strong and significant role in the politics of teacher certification, though there seems to be some decline in their influence. Largely, their role gets played out in state legislatures, state boards of education, and on advisory boards and commissions. What is clear is that unions are able to ensure at least a representative role in the politics of teacher education. McDonnell and Pascal have observed that unions play two distinct roles in the educational reform process. "First, they operate as political interest groups, working to obtain benefits from the external environment. And, second, they also function as voluntary organizations that must meet members' demands in the type and level of benefits they obtain and the services they provide" (McDonnell and Pascal,1988, p. vii). Whether they are able to control the political process is another question. Indeed, they have had to fight in almost every state against additional testing requirements, merit pay and other issues posing problems for their political views. One has to wonder if this political defensiveness has given them the capacity or even the interest to substantively address the critical issues associated with the reform of teacher preparation and the role of the teacher in the public school. In other words, their political energy is expended protecting their own interests rather than proposing innovative ideas--they are players, not innovators.

There are differences across states. In Georgia, three teacher organizations, the Georgia Education Association, an AFT affiliate in the Atlanta area, and the Professional Association of Georgia Educators (PAGE) have battled among themselves over positions on state policy. PAGE has endorsed virtually all policies, rules, regulations and legislation that have shifted power and responsibility to the state, including proposals requiring teachers to meet additional testing requirements (McDonnell and Pascal, 1988).

In contrast to this posture of accommodation on the part of the Georgia teacher groups are the two Pennsylvania organizations. McDonnell and Pascal reported that both the Pennsylvania State Educators (the NEA affiliate) and the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers (the AFT affiliate) joined forces to oppose a mandate from the State Board of Education requiring six course credits every five years for renewal of teaching certificates. While they failed in their opposition, it is unusual to see such cooperation.

In the six other states in this study, teacher unions have continued to influence state educational policy in the respective legislatures through direct lobbying efforts and by getting their representatives placed on advisory boards. They have not, however, assumed either the accommodation model of Georgia or the collective action model of Pennsylvania.

They also observed that "the decrease in teacher organization influence can also be attributed to the ascendancy

of other groups, particularly those representing the business community" (pp. 27).

Individual legislators and legislatures, according to Wirt and Kirst, who cite a six-state study that found that among the policy making elite, as a whole ranked as the most influential in the state policy making process (1989, p. 267). This ranking comes from perceptions of other policy makers. This research is consistent with my findings in the eight SEE states where most of the policy activity in the last two years that has affected teacher education policy came from the legislature, often with the support of governors. Examples of such policies include recent legislative initiatives relating to alternative certification of teachers, additional courses in the certification requirements,and adding time on to state standards for length of the student teaching experience.

Wirt and Kirst note that "the legislative role in school policy making has recently changed. Education was once a source of limited interest to legislators, but of late they have taken a strong hand in finance reform and in minimum competency testing" (p.284). Such new interest on the part of legislators in state teacher education policy making has been influenced by the "spread of ideas across states because of interstate organizations like the National Conference of State Legislatures and the Education Commission of the States" (p. 284).

Governors were particularly busy as they lead the reform of state educational systems in the 1980s. It might be argued that the publication of A Nation At Risk contributed to their activism. The message from A Nation At Risk was that the states are the responsible political entities for substantive educational reform, shifting the federal role to a much more passive one.

It is important to note the context in which this shift to state responsibility occurred. The early eighties witnessed the Reagan philosophy of federalism in practice. States had to accept a greater share of health and human service financial responsibilities. In short, states had to raise taxes to fund educational reforms. Gaining public support for increased taxes during the Reagan era was no easy matter. Governors succeeded at raising taxes because they attached accountability measures and connected the importance of good schools with good jobs.

The Task Force on Education for Economic Growth of the Education Commission of the States, chaired by Governor James Hunt of North Carolina, included the governors of thirteen states and ten chief executive officers of the nations largest corporations. This task force's report, Action for Excellence (1983), implied that improved economic conditions for states could be achieved by improving the education systems. In many instances this approach represented a politically viable way for governors to initiate educational reform. The report called for

states to develop methods of measuring the effectivness of teachers--the result being a significant increase in the testing of would-be teachers and teachers already teaching. It might be argued that, coupled with A Nation at Risk and Reagan federalism, this report galvanized the role of the governors in initiating educational reform packages.

In his case studies of six governors, Laboratories of Democracy: A new Breed of Governor Creates Models for National Growth, David Osborne suggests that a new political paradigm is emerging in states that require governors to accept political responsibility for the economic health of their respective states. Osborne argues that directly related to the economic health of states is the quality of the educational system. By coupling the ideas of a sound economy with better schools, governors were politically able to propose and implement many educational reforms.

After leading sweeping educational reforms in his own state and serving as both chair of the Education Commission of the States and as Chair of the National Governors' Association (the first time any governor has served as chair of both organizations at the same time), Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas explained this new activism on the part of his fellow governors in a speech at the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy in 1988. Clinton suggested that President Reagan's eight years in office "had been a major force in changing and enlarging the governor's job" (Clinton, 1988). Wirt and Kirst provide support for Clinton's

thesis: "... the academic and teacher quality reforms of the 1980's produced a new activism on the part of governors" (p.285). Wirt and Kirst also noted that "this office is becoming more politicized over educational policy. In 1986 three of four governor's focused on education in their campaigns" (pp. 285-86).

The state education agency in all but three states, houses the offices officially charged with the regulation of teacher certification and program approval of state teacher preparation programs. I again turn to Wirt and Kirst for a general description of the modern state education agencies (SEAs). "Specialists in little niches of expertise, SEAs constitute a complex of daily carriers for curriculum, finance and accounting, administration, personnel, and many other matters. Their political influence may be the most subtle, that of inertia defending the status quo. Their role in innovation and its implementation is one of the many unstudied aspects of the educational policy system, but it appears to be increasing because of state initiatives concerning testing, teacher quality, and local academic standards" (Wirt and Kirst, 1989, p. 289).

State education agencies form the administrative staff for chief state school officers and state boards of education. In addition to regulation of teacher certification and approval of teacher education programs, SEAs regulate and often control state policies relative to curriculum, school construction, transportation, state special education programs etc.

SEAs have slowly moved toward providing technical assistance to schools districts and the conduct of research and dissemination. They also administer and regulate federal educational programs.

In my interviews with state agency staff in the states I learned that new staff members have been added to deal with the additional bureaucratic burdens imposed because of reforms. Interestingly, these new staff members were primarily needed to handle the results of tests needed to determine if candidates for licensure met the state requirements.

Chief State School Officers and State Boards of Education are largely responsible for government oversight and implementation of state policy. Indeed, those in the certification offices are essentially under the purview of state boards and CSSOs--in short they are where the buck stops in the teacher education policy making process. It is important to note, however, that the relationship between state boards and CSSOs varies from state to state because of how CSSOs and boards are selected. In thirty-three states the state boards are appointed by the governor, fourteen are elected by direct popular vote or by some other representative body of the people in the states. Of the CSSOs, four are selected by the governors in the states, twenty-one are elected by popular vote, and twenty-five are appointed by the state board of education.

State boards and CSSOs rely heavily on their certification

offices for direction and research relating to the development of teacher education policy. However, coupled to the certification offices is yet one more entity within the teacher education policy domain at the state level--teacher education advisory boards.

Teacher Education Advisory Boards include heavy representation of teachers and teacher educators. These advisory boards conduct much of the business of determining what the entry standards into teacher education programs should be, what the standards should be in state approved teacher education programs, and the revision of such standards. More recently such advisory bodies have conducted test selections for certification. Interview data with certification staff members in the eight SEE states indicated that rarely do state boards adopt positions against the recommendations of these advisory bodies.

PART III

TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY MAKING IN EIGHT STATES

The previous section is intended to provide an overview of state structure and policy action relating to teacher education. We now consider the policy process in teacher education in the eight states and identify some important issues occupying the time of the policy players in these particular states.

What follows is a contextual review of teacher education policy making in eight states with particular attention to those players who have most recently been active and a summary of the issues attracting their attention. In addition to a review of summary documentation from the eight states and summary information from the AACTE data and the NASDTEC sources, data were obtained by means of interviews with key personnel at the state level in each state.

CALIFORNIA

Perhaps the best introduction to teacher education policy making in California in recent years is to note that one of the more acclaimed reports to recommend reform and change in teacher preparation and practice was a California product. The 1985 report, Who Will Teach Our Children? emerged from the work of the California Commission on the Teaching Profession. This commission started its work in 1984 as a result of legislation introduced in the California General Assembly. The Commission

was made up of seventeen California citizens distinguished in education, business, and public policy. The members were appointed by Assembly Education Chairwoman Teresa Hughes, Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig, and Senate Education Committee Chairman Gary Hart, as was required by the enabling legislation. Funded by a $400,000 grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Commission sponsored seven hearings and commissioned seventeen research papers.

Who Will Teach Our Children? set the stage for and previewed several themes later contained in the reports of both Holmes and Carnegie. The California report proposed three steps for "making teaching more of a profession." It recommended: (1) The restructuring of the career of teaching; (2) Establish more rigorous professional standards; (3) A redesign of the K-12 schools to be more productive and be able to recruit capable men and women to teaching (California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985).

The report contained 27 specific recommendations about how to meet the three steps noted above. The California report might be considered more courageous than the subsequent reports from Holmes and Carnegie in that the report contained specific recommendations (e.g. which group should act on each recommendation and estimate of costs and savings). The report also points out that many of the recommendations entail little or no costs.

The California State Players

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) members are appointed by the governor as required by statute. The CCTC was established in 1970. As noted already in this report California is one of three states nationwide to have an independent state agency responsible for the certification of teachers and the approval of teacher education progams. State law orginally specified membership to include: five certified school personnel (including three teachers, one adminstrator, and one support services person), three full-time faculty members from public and private institutions (including one teacher education faculty member), two school board representatives, seven public representatives, and five nonvoting ex-officio members--these include the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and one representative each of the University of California Board of Regents and the California State Board of Trustees, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AACTE, 1988). However, in September of 1988, the Bergeson Act reconstituted the CCTC by giving professional educators a majority of the voting members by increasing by three the number of public school teachers to six, reducing university faculty members from three to one, reducing the public members by three, reducing school board representatives by two.

The autonomy of the CCTC contrasts with similiar bodies in the other seven states. While the other states have educational constituent-laden advisory boards and commissions they do not have the full regulatory authority as does the CCTC. The CCTC has the final say regarding teacher education and certification policy, except for mandates from the California General Assembly.

Recent issues occupying CCTC attention include: raising entrance standards for teacher education programs to be equal to or above standards for other professional programs, and requiring additional subject area certification testing, and mentoring new teachers (Mastain, April 1989). Additionally, the CCTC continues to issue the "Professional Clear Credential." This credential is issued following the completion of a fifth-year program of study. Specifically, this credential requires a bachelor's degree or higher degree and the completion of a teacher education program approved by CCTC, including student teaching, basic skills examination; plus a fifth year of study beyond the bachelors degree that includes specific course work in health education, special education, the U.S. Constitution, and course work on reading instruction; and finally the recommendation of a California college or university with a CCTC-approved Multiple or Single Subject program (NASDTEC, 1988).

Alternative Certification in California has existed in California since 1983. The process requires tests of basic skills and subject matter. Candidates must have completed forty five units in the subject area they intend to teach. It is essentially a school-based process. School districts must provide the "trainee" with development programs directed by a "mentor teacher." The legislation requires that the district " must consult with a California institution of higher learning in the development of the district-based training program. CCTC's role is to "verify" that fully certificated personnel are not available. Full certification can be obtained after two years in the district based system (Mastain, April 1989; NASDTEC, 1988).

The two major unions in California are: The California Teachers Association (the NEA affiliate) and the California Federation of Teachers (the AFT affiliate). The California Teachers Association (CTA) has four times the number of members as does the California Federation of Teachers (CFT). McDonnell and Pascal have described the differences between the two organizations against a backdrop of state educational reform: "There are serious differences between the two organizations. For example, the CTA has actively opposed new policies that include peer evaluation of teachers while the CFT endorsed them. The CTA and the CFT have also taken different positions on a variety of other policies. For example, the CTA opposed a provision in SB 813 (California's 1983 omnibus educational reform legislation) that requires practicing teachers to participate in

some type of professional growth activities as a condition for renewing their credentials every five years" (p. 31). McDonnell and Pascal summarize the role unions in teacher policy reform by noting: "The teacher organizations have alternated between muted opposition and accommodation, depending on the issues and the level of risk and payoff involved" (p. 31).

Richard Mastain, Executive Director of the CCTC, has noted that neither union has been particularly influential among the members of the CCTC. In his view the two California unions have concentrated their political influence on the legislative process (Mastain, 1989).

The California General Assembly has been a major player in educational reform. California State Senator Gary Hart and Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes, the chairs of their respective legislative education committees, were chief architects in the state's 1983 reform legislation, SB 813. This legislation included the California's mentor teacher plan, teacher evaluation, reduction in the length of starting teachers probationary periods specifically, and funding issues in general. David Mastain indicated last spring that the implementation of SB 813 still occupies the time of policy makers and local school districts, particularly the California Mentor Teacher Plan (CMT), which is described below in the California issues summary. He also indicated that the legislature has turned its attention to more pressing issues such as school finance, school facility

shortages, and according to Mastain, left teacher education policy up to the CCTC (Mastain, April, 1989).

California Governor George Deukmeijan has not proposed any new policy relating to teacher education, other than appointing new members to the CCTC. Mastain suggested that Deukmeijan may see the CCTC as the chief agency for this process and has, therefore taken a "hands-off" position (Mastain,1989).

According to Mastain, in the last two budget years Deukmeijan has prioritized line-item funds in his appropriations budgets to support programs in teacher evaluation and in professional development activities of the CCTC (Mastain, 1989).

State Superintendent Bill Honig and the State Board of Education

Bill Honig has developed a national reputation as a leader in education reform and now is in his second term as California's chief state school officer. He has promoted stronger academic requirements for high school graduation, better textbooks in California schools, and more rigorous preparation requirements for teachers. Honig has politically stationed himself as chief promoter of the California educational enterprise. He serves on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, adding to his already national stature.

David Mastain again adds to the understanding of this California player: "He has consistently supported CCTC policies that have strengthened standards for teacher preparation, particularly additional testing standards, course work requirements, and differentiated staffing under the California Mentor Teacher Program" (Mastain, April 1989). Mastain also noted that Honig has challenged Governor Deukmeijan on numerous occasions regarding the funding of California's K-12 School System.

The California State Board

With the creation of the CCTC and the 1988 Bergeson Act that removed veto authority from the State Board over CCTC decisions, the California State Board of Education no longer has any substantive role in teacher education and teacher policy issues.

California Issues Summary

I have already described the alternative certification process in California. While potentially still a critical issue, the CCTC has directed policy attention to teacher evaluation and teacher professional development. The current focus of California teacher policy is dominated by the California Mentor Teachers Plan.

Teachers who are selected and evaluated as "exemplary" receive an extra $4,000 stipend to perform two extra responsibilities: (1) work on curriculum development, and (2) work with other teachers--that is, new teachers. Only five percent of a school district's total teaching staff can serve as California's Mentor Teachers (AACTE, 1988).

Implementation is left to local districts. McDonnell and Pascal, drawing from Bird (1986), write: "Bird found in his study of the mentor program in ten districts that local teacher organizations often sought arrangements for the program that reflected their organizational interests. These included 'short terms for mentors' (allowing rotation of more teachers through mentorships), mentors proposing independent projects, and mentors' confidential service on individual teacher's request.' Our findings for three of the four California sample districts

are similiar" (1988, p. 42).

This program has been controversial among teachers. McDonnell and Pascal have suggested that controversy has arisen because of "the legislative origins of the program." They noted that "it was created as a way to postpone dealing with questions of performance-based compensation (McDonnell and Pascal, 1988, p. 42).

Further problems occurred because of the imposed limitations on who can actually be a California Mentor Teacher. The selection process has been largely left to local districts. The politics of the selection process has created jealousy among staff members in local districts according to a study of teacher leadership roles in California (Wagner, 1986, cited in Darling-Hammond and Berry, 1988).

COLORADO

Certification Staff

The Colorado Department of Education's Office of teacher certification and teacher education is directed by John Walker who served as my central contact for inquiring into the teacher education policy domain in Colorado. According to Walker, the teacher education policy development process is largely determined by the advisory board to the state board of education--the Colorado Commission on Teacher Education and Certification (CTEC). This commission is appointed by the Colorado State Board of Education. Ten members serve on the CTEC, including five

teachers, one principal, one system-wide administrator, one district program supervisor, one dean or chair of a Colorado SCDE, one SCDE faculty member, and the state education commissioner. Specifically, the CTEC acts as an advisory body for the State Board of Education in the development of state certification requirements and in the development of teacher education program approval standards.

Colorado Teacher Organizations

Except for a relatively small American Federation of Teachers affiliate in the Denver metropolitan area, Colorado's major teachers' organization is the Colorado Education Association (CEA), an NEA affiliate. Walker reported that the CEA's major contribution to the teacher policy domain is its participation in the political process. This includes political action in elective politics. Because the Colorado Board of Education positions are elected positions these political races are particularly important to CEA. Walker indicated that CEA enjoys the support of at least two Colorado State Board members (Walker, May 1989). Walker noted that the particular focus for the CEA has been mounting opposition to recent (1985) proposals by the Colorado Legislature. Specifically, this opposition has been against the increased testing requirements for teacher candidates.

The Colorado State Legislature

In 1985, in cooperation with Governor Richard Lamm, the Colorado General Assembly initiated The Program for Quality Education. This major education reform package included projects for locally developed teacher incentive plans, minority teacher recruitment and alternative certification.

Under this program, twenty pilot projects were granted funds to test the value of innovative programs to advance teaching in the state (Walker, May 1989). Walker noted that in 1987 the Colorado Department of Education published an evaluative report of these pilot programs and the conclusion was that a statewide approach was not feasible. Essentially, the state decided that local school districts should assume responsibility for determining guidelines and recognition for teacher advancement.

More recent Colorado Legislative initiatives have included efforts to limit teacher education courses and to reduce the number of Colorado colleges and universities that offer teacher education programs. One proposal would have concentrated teacher preparation at Northern Colorado University. These proposals are still being debated by legislators (Walker, May 1989).

Governor Roy Romer

Governor Romer was preceded by a particularly outspoken governor, Richard Lamm, who left several programs to be completed by the Colorado Legislature. Those programs relating to teacher education policy are summarized above in the Colorado Legislative

section. Romer's press office reported no specific policy proposals relating to teacher education and referred me to the Colorado Department of Education. Recent information suggests that Governor Romer is now very much interested in seeking to join the reform of schools and teacher education in the state.

The Colorado Department of Education

Walker described Colorado as "pretty much a local control state." This implied, at least, that the Colorado Department of Education has not been an agency devoted to innovation. Indeed, Walker indicated that the CDE has been attending to its historical mission--that of a regulatory agency (Walker, 1989).

According to Walker, the office of certification has had some conflict with the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the state agency responsible for administrative oversight of the Colorado public institutions of higher education. The source of this conflict relates to a 1986 regulation promulgated by the Higher Education Commission prohibiting state institutions from offering baccalaureate degrees in elementary and secondary education. This took effect in the fall of 1989. This now changes the certification process for new teacher candidates. They will now be required to have an academic major. Walker indicated that Colorado SCDE's have had to complete revisions of their teacher preparation programs to meet this regulative mandate by September 1989 (Walker).

State Education Commissioner, William T. Randall

Randall is an appointed CSSO. The Colorado State Board of Education has the constitutional authority for his appointment. According to Walker, Randall has deferred much of the day-to-day attention to teacher educational policy issues to the certification office and has not initiated policy proposals in the teacher education policy domain.

The Colorado State Board of Education

There are eight state board members. Interestingly, they are elected by congressional districts. Walker indicated the elective politics "usually pits the Colorado Association of School Administrators against the Colorado Education Association." Walker indicated that the state board has deferred teacher education policy making to the ten-member Commission on Teacher Education and Certification described above.

Colorado Issues Summary

Colorado is one of eight states to fundamentally alter the length of the teacher preparation process by doing away with undergraduate majors at the elementary and secondary levels. Colorado has not added much to the 1985 teacher reforms pushed by former Governor Lamm.

Unlike most other states, the Colorado teacher education policy process has included the Commission on Higher Education in

that the Commission has taken steps to eliminate the education undergraduate majors.

GEORGIA

Georgia was one of several southern states to enact comprehensive educational reform in the early eighties. Led by Governor Joe Frank Harris, Georgia was one of four southern states to raise taxes to pay for the 1983-84 reforms. Additionally, Georgia was one of three states to require already licensed teachers to be tested for recertification (Arkansas and Texas are the other two). The Georgia tests included a general knowledge test, specific subject matter test, and a test of oral communication skills. It is a fair assumption that Georgia policy makers relied heavily on test performance as a measure of minimum competence for their state certificated teachers.

Certification Staff

My contacts and subsequent interviews with the Office of Certification staff included interviews with the Director, John Hooper, and with the staff person responsible for issues relating to teacher education, Juanita Wyatt.

This office has had primary responsibility for the administration of the legislation creating the Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Program (TPAP). Part of Governor Joe Frank Harris' reform package, this 1983 legislation requires that all teachers with less than three years of teaching experience and holding a provisional teaching certificate must be evaluated by the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI).

The TPAI is first used in the fall of a teacher's first year. New teachers must undergo six assessments before receiving a renewable Georgia teaching certificate. The TPAI purports to measure performance in fourteen identified "competency areas" as measured by an assessment team. The team includes three external evaluators, usually a peer teacher; a principal; and an outside or external evaluator who might come from an intermediate unit, the state department of education or a college or university. It is the responsibility of this assessment team to determine if the teacher has successfully demonstrated competency in the fourteen areas (Wyatt, June, 1989).

The implications of this teacher assessment for Georgia SCDEs are important. The intent behind the the TPAI suggests that the legislation was meant to assess not only teacher performance in the classroom but also the performance of the SCDE from which the teacher graduated. Indeed, the collective results are reported back to the SCDE's college or university. Wyatt indicated that all Georgia teacher preparing institutions are "responding positively to the TPAI" (Wyatt,1989). (Note: This

report is in disagreement with the findings of the research team conducting the Study of the Education of Educators).

While the Georgia Department of Education's Office of Certification has primary responsibility for the implementation of the TPAI, the Georgia Legislature gave oversight authority of the SCDE's to the Georgia State Board of Regents (BOR), the higher education coordinating board. If the passing rate on the Georgia certification tests and the TPAI are below 70% in any Georgia SCDE, the BOR has the authority to place the SCDE on probation for three years, or until the scores improve. If no improvement is measured, the BOR can direct the office of certification to not issue licenses to graduates of the SCDE in question (Wyatt,1989).

The AACTE observed in 1988 that "a class action law suit was filed in 1986 claiming that the state's teacher-testing policies are racially discriminatory. A recent settlement will still permit the use of the test and the assessment procedures. The state will be required to give a $6,000 study grant to those teachers who lost certification because of failing the assessment process in the first few years of operation" (AACTE, 1988).

The Georgia Professional Standards Commission

This commission is appointed by the governor. There is no statutory requirement for membership, though it draws from the ranks of teachers, administrators, SCDE faculty, local school district board member and state department of education staff

(Wyatt, 1989). The commission has two responsibilities: (1) to advise the state board of education on standards for licensure; and (2) to advise the state board on entry standards into SCDE programs. As the two responsibilities suggest, this commission has advisory authority only and does not have independent powers of the state board of education.

Georgia Teacher Organizations

I noted in Section II that the Georgia unions were largely ineffective in opposing any components of the TPAI. Indeed, Wyatt reported that it was her view that many rank and file teachers supported the process. However, McDonnell and Pascal noted that the main opposition to the assessment process came through the Georgia Education Association's filing of the lawsuit claiming that the process was unfair to minority teachers. The issue was settled out of court and consisted of the study grants and continued use of the process as noted above.

The Georgia State Legislature

The 1983 reform legislation--The Georgia Quality Basic Education Act (GQBE)--remains an important part of the professional lives of all Georgia educators. This seems clear because of the continued attention to the specific provisions of the legislation. I have previously described under the state certification office the details of the provisions affecting teachers and the teacher educators in Georgia.

Also included in the 1983 GQBE was a specific provision allowing for alternative certification of Georgia teachers. While intended for "specific shortage fields" this policy is open for those interested in meeting the requirements, which primarily include completing a series of college courses, a one-year supervised intern period, the certification test requirements and the TPAI assessment.

In 1985, the Georgia Legislature established the Georgia Career Ladder Task Force to make recommendations for a specific plan for the creation of different levels of teacher certification. This has yet to come to fruition, though several proposals are pending before the legislature for funding.

Georgia Governor Joe Frank Harris

Governor Harris was one of several southern governors to push through legislatures an educational reform package from 1983-87. Harris had as strong allies the Georgia business community which strongly supported the testing and performance-based compensation, described in the previous section. Harris is in his third term as Governor of Georgia.

Georgia Issues Summary

As noted in the preceding section, the Georgia State Legislature targeted teacher education as a major area of reform. The Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Program has placed pressure on the state's teacher education programs to ensure that

their graduates meet the performance standards in fourteen "competency areas." While consistent with many other reform policies of the 1980s, the Georgia program firmly announces who is in charge of establishing not simply general standards of the teaching enterprise but specific standards relating to performance. The Georgia legislature has clearly stated that it will be the authorizing agent of teacher education policy.

ILLINOIS

Illinois, like Colorado, has also enacted policies that have emphasized a stronger liberal arts component in the education of teachers. According to Lee Vartolini of the Certification and Placement Office in the Illinois Department of Education, 1985 reform legislation called for "a stronger liberal arts preparation of prospective teachers" (Vartolini, 1989). Of special note is the requirement that this emphasis on liberal arts apply to elementary teachers. Effective in 1988, elementary teachers must have a minimum of twenty-four semester hours in a specific content area. The requirement for secondary teachers is thirty-two semester hours.

Certification Staff

Vartolini indicated that his office (Certification and Placement Office) has concentrated during the last two years on monitoring changes made by teacher education programs in Illinois due to the new requirements for liberal arts courses. In

addition, the Illinois State Board of Education has asked the Certification and Placement Office to follow through on the Board's regulations to expand to a full semester the student teaching component in the initial teacher certification standards, and initiate a program to assist beginning teachers and a plan to develop "alternative graduate programs for nontraditional students" (Vartolini, 1989). In addition, legislation in 1986 made the State Board of Education the implementer of certain components of the Education Reform Act of 1986.

Essentially, this legislation authorized the establishment of the Center for Excellence within the Illinois Department of Education under the auspices of the State Board of Education.

The initial charge of the Center was to conduct a study of teacher career compensation plans based on merit. The legislation authorized the funding of up to seven pilot projects, starting in the 1986-87 school year. Five projects are still in operation and the State Board is still evaluating these projects to determine the feasibility of a statewide program.

The Illinois General Assembly

The 1985 and 1986 sessions of the Illinois General Assembly created a number of specific teacher policies, most of which are described above. In the 1986 session, the General Assembly created the Illinois Blue Ribbon Committee on the Improvement of Teaching as a Profession. This committee met in late 1986 and

through 1987, making recommendations to the General Assembly and the State Board of Education, some of which have become State Board regulations. Again, those that have become actual regulations are noted above.

Governor James Thompson

Thompson has been a supporter of the stronger liberal arts component included in Illinois certification requirements. According to Vartolini, Thompson has not been particularly active in proposing teacher education policies and has deferred policy initiation to the State Board and the General Assembly (Vartolini, 1989).

Illinois State Education Agency, CSSO, and the State Board

As in other states, these three state agencies and their staffs have had to bear the responsibility of implementing the legislative mandates and recommendations from the advisory committee. Their responsibilities have been primarily the promulgation of rules and regulations emerging out of the Illinois Blue Ribbon Committee on the Improvement of Teaching as a Profession (see above).

Ted Sanders, while Chief State School Officer, according to Vartolini, had provided the administrative leadership for this implementing function and had not initiated any specific teacher education policies of his own design. (Note: At the time of writing, Sanders serves in the United States Department of

Education).

Illinois Teacher Certification Board

This board is appointed by the Illinois Chief State School Officer. It advises the State Board of Education on issues of certification and teacher education program approval. Members primarily include K-12 school administrators, SCDE and other higher education institution staff members. Vartolini indicated that this advisory board has taken a back seat to the Illinois Blue Ribbon Committee referred to above (Vartolini, 1989).

Illinois Issues Summary

Teacher education reforms in Illinois have been largely programmatic: expanding student teaching to a full semester, establishing a mentor teacher program, and creating pilot career ladder teacher pay plans. As previously noted, Illinois has placed special emphasis on a strong liberal arts component in the teacher education curriculum.

Teacher education policy is made by several different policy bodies in Illinois, including a special committee charged with strengthening the teaching profession in Illinois--the Illinois Blue Ribbon Committee on the Improvement of Teaching as a Profession. The State Board has played the most active role in initiating the policies discussed above. The legislature's involvement in teacher reform has come from appointed committees (The Blue Ribbon Committee) rather than from mandates.

IOWA

As already mentioned in this report, Iowa has the distinction of being the first state to statutorily endorse the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. This 1987 legislation coincides with several other legislative initiatives important to teacher education in Iowa.

Certification Staff

Merrill Halter, Staff Consultant for the Iowa Teacher Education, Certification and Staff Development Office in the Iowa Department of Public Instruction said in an interview that he and his colleagues in the office have "in the last three years been consumed with the legislature's position that Iowa teacher candidates be subjected to more rigorous licensure standards" (Halter, 1989).

Unions

Iowa is a state with one teacher organization--the Iowa Education Association, (IEA), an NEA affiliate. Halter indicated that "the IEA is influential in the development of certification policies, though this influence has declined in recent years" (Halter, 1989). Halter did note, however, that the IEA has played a constructive role in the development of certification requirements and did not oppose the National Board legislation.

The Iowa Legislature

1987 witnessed a watershed session of the Iowa Legislature in regards to teacher and teacher education policy. This included: (1) funding for cooperating teachers to assist beginning teachers; (2) appropriations for the development of "clinical schools," that is, sites for internships and teacher training; (3) a student teacher evaluation plan, designed to assess the skills of new teachers, and (4) the establishment of the Educational Excellence Program. This program consists of the following components: (a) the recruitment of teachers, (b) the retention of quality teachers, and (c) improving the quality, effectiveness, and performance of teachers. The program has been planned to be implemented in three phases. Phase I establishes a minimum teacher salary of $18,000; Phase II provides local boards off education with funds to improve salaries above the minimum; Phase III promotes excellence through the development of performance-based pay plans and supplemental pay plans based on additional work. Specific implementation of these policies is a State Board of Education charge but has the serious attention of a legislative oversight committee (Iowa Department of Public Instruction, 1988; Halter, 1989).

In addition to the above, legislation was passed adding additional college credits in specific subject matter areas for prospective teachers. Halter indicated that the 1987 legislative initiatives followed the 1986 legislation requiring that all those in local districts be trained in the evaluation of

teachers. This legislation mandates uniform teacher evaluation forms to be used by all Iowa school districts, requires one full day of inservice every five years for cooperating teachers, and requires that all faculty in SCDE's spend forty hours every five years in Iowa public schools.

In 1988, the Iowa Legislature passed a resolution that requires the Department of Public Instruction to "develop criteria for enhancing clinical experiences of prospective teachers." The office of certification is still preparing guidelines to meet the requirements of the resolution (Halter, 1989).

Iowa State Board of Education and the CSSO

AACTE provides a summary of state board activity in the area of teacher education: In 1986 the Iowa State Board instituted new standards for program approval of SCDE's. The regulations require the creation of practitioner committees to advise Iowa's SCDEs on program design. Included in these new regulations were additional coursework in the following areas:

(1) exceptional children (special education)

(2) gifted and talented children

(3) a course stipulation that requires child development, methods classes and student teaching to be specific to the grade level of the endorsement being sought (AACTE, 1989).

Iowa Governor Terry Branstad

As current chair of the National Governors' Association Branstad received publicity as an outspoken supporter of alternative certification. After attending a White House sponsored conference on alternatives in education in the spring of 1989, Branstad pushed through the Iowa Legislature a bill requiring the Department of Public Instruction to "develop plans for those who want to be teachers but who did not graduate from approved teacher education programs" (Halter, 1989).

Branstad has also been a vocal supporter of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. According to Halter, his support has been based on his view that NBPTS will add more rigor to the teacher certification process (Halter, 1989).

The Iowa Elementary and Secondary Advisory Committee

This committee has the responsibility to make recommendations to the State Department of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education relating to certification and program approval requirements. This committee has thirteen members, including eight teachers, two administrators, two college representatives, and one area education agency representative (Halter, 1989).

According to Halter, the committee's role may change significantly, or it may disband because the same legislation that granted official state endorsement of the National Board called for the Development of a State Teaching Standards Board.

As of September 1989, such a board has yet to be developed.

Iowa Issue Summary

Iowa's embrace of the basic framework of the policies proposed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards stands out as an important new development in the politics of education in the state. Iowa has also initiated an alternative certification policy that loosens the connection between state licensure and teachers and teacher educators in the state. The creation of these policies may or may not relate to the presence of a strong governor who is deeply involved in the national educational politics being nurtured by the National Governors' Association and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; nonetheless, Branstad has successfully pushed these measures with little opposition.

MASSACHUSETTS

The Public School Improvement Act of 1985, initiated by the Massachusetts legislature with support of Governor Michael Dukakis, established a program of education reform that included several types of teacher incentive programs. As in Iowa, this legislation created a minimum teacher's salary of $18,000 and state funding of tuition for those college students agreeing to teach in Massachusetts.

Also established was the Horace Mann Teacher Program and the Lucretia Crocker Exemplary Education Program. The former program expanded duties for teachers, including responsibilities for teacher training, developing curricula, providing special assistance to those students identified as potential dropouts, and as inservice instructors or consultants to teacher education programs. The State Board guidelines for the Horace Mann Program permit each school district to apply for a grant of up to $120 per teacher, with a maximum compensation of $2,500. Legislation in 1988 increased these amounts, but, according to Dennis DiCarlo in the Bureau of Teacher Preparation, Certification and Placement, the state has not been able to fund the extra amounts due to a downturn in state finances (DiCarlo, 1989).

The Lucretia Crocker program was created to award teacher fellowships to develop, replicate, and disseminate exemplary educational programs that have been successful in advancing academic and creative achievement and for creating better school climates. The state is now supporting 16 fellows with an

appropriation of $504,000 (DiCarlo, 1989).

Certification Staff

The Massachusetts Bureau of Teacher Preparation, Certification and Placement, an office in the Massachusetts Department of Education, has the responsiblity for oversight of teacher certification requirement and for program approval of the state's teacher education programs.

Since October 1987, the Bureau has had responsibility for implementing the recommendations of the Joint Task Force on Teacher Preparation, created by the Massachusetts Legislature. The Task Force issued a report in 1987 entitled, "Making Teaching A Major Profession." DiCarlo indicated that the recommendations are intended for implementation in 1993. Specifically, the implementation plan calls for the establishment of a two- step certification process for Massachusetts teachers. The first stage involves the completion of a bachelor's degree in liberal arts, which makes prospective teachers eligible for provisional certification. The second step involves completion of a master's degree over a 2 year period under the guidance of a mentor teacher, with assistance from a liberal arts faculty advisor and one SCDE faculty advisor. The Massachusetts State Board has formally adopted this plan, beginning with the undergraduate class of 1993. Effective in 1993, a liberal arts and science or interdisciplinary degree will be required for initial certification. DiCarlo noted that, as with other funding issues

in Massachusetts education in the current fiscal climate, it is possible the implementation target date might change (DiCarlo, 1989).

Massachusetts Teacher Organizations

DiCarlo indicated that the dominate teacher education association in Massachusetts is the Massachusetts Teacher Association (MTA), an NEA affiliate. The MTA, according to DiCarlo, attempts to influence teacher certification and teacher education policy through their representative on the Massachusetts Advisory Commission on Education Personnel (see below). DiCarlo indicated that the MTA has been helpful in the 1987 reforms, though somewhat cautious in its endorsement because of questions of funding in the last three years (DiCarlo, 1989).

Massachusetts Advisory Commission on Education Personnel

This commission serves as an advisory group to the Massachusetts State Board of Education on matters pertaining to teacher education and teacher certification. Members are nominated by their constituent groups, i.e., the MTA, Massachusetts School Administrators Association, and state AACTE representatives. One third of the commission must be teachers; otherwise there are no stipulations regarding membership.

In 1987 the State Board of Education created a similiar group called the Certification Review Panel. This panel is responsible for reviewing applications of those individuals who want to be teachers in Massachusetts but who have not graduated from an approved teacher education program. DiCarlo indicated that this process has not been used much. He noted that the review process is basically a review of the applicant's experience and college transcripts.

The Massachusetts Legislature

In 1988 Massachusetts responded to recommendations contained in the Carnegie report, Teachers For the 21st Century. Specifically, the legislature wanted to develop a program to provide teachers with more autonomy. A program of "Carnegie Schools" is designed to encourage "professional discretion through restructuring." There are provisions to allow waivers of state and local rules and regulations, and collective bargaining provisions. The announcement of the first five to seven schools to be funded under this program was delayed due to funding problems (DiCarlo, 1989).

Governor Michael Dukakis

Economic development has been a primary focus of the Dukakis administration (Osborne, 1988). DiCarlo reported that, while Dukakis has been a strong supporter of a fully funded education system, he has largely relied on the other players in the policy

domain of teacher education--"he has not proposed any particular policies in these areas though he has supported the legislative initiatives" described above (Dicarlo, 1989).

The Massachusetts Department of Education (MDE) and CSSO Raynolds

The MDE has been busy implementing and sustaining minimum funding for the various programs noted above. The Commissioner of Education, Harold Raynolds Jr. has had to focus on the funding problems in the last three years and has had to cut staff in the Department in order to keep the programs alive. DiCarlo indicated that the "legislature has worked cooperatively with the department in recent years" but the department has had to be forceful in suggesting to the legislative leadership that "without more funding for the new programs" it is not in the best interest of the Massachusetts educational system to pursue additional initiatives (DiCarlo, 1989).

DiCarlo also emphasized that the legislature had the foresight to allow the State Department of Education to implement a testing program that allows teacher education programs some flexibility in determining their own curriculum requirements. Instead of requiring specific course requirements, the state teacher education program approval process consists of evaluating the programs based on five broad standards of teacher knowledge rather than on specific courses taken or passed.

Massachusetts Issues Summary

In 1985-86, Massachusetts initiated several programs in teacher policy. The Horace Mann Teacher Program and the Lucretia Crocker Program were initially to be sufficiently enough to make significant advances in salaries and create greater teacher responsibility in the school setting. In addition, Massachusetts was one of the first states (1987) to propose state support of schools free to explore "restructuring" strategies. These "Carnegie Schools," like other proposals, have fallen victim to significant cutbacks in state funding.

OKLAHOMA

Certification Staff

The staff of the Teacher Education, Testing and Staff Development division have had primary responsibility for the implementation of the 1985 legislative initiatives that created a statewide teacher evaluation program. This included the development of a "narrative observation instrument" to be used by Entry-year Assistance Committees. According to Joseph Weaver, Director of this division in the Oklahoma Department of Education, "over 7,000 teachers have gone through the entry-year program" (Weaver, 1989).

Essentially, this program requires that a team (entry-year assistance committee) consisting of a teacher consultant, a school administrator, and a faculty member from an Oklahoma SCDE, evaluate and assist first-year teachers. Each teacher is

observed three times by the entire team. It then becomes the responsibility of the team to recommend to the state the teacher for continuing certification.

Weaver suggested that this process now occupies close to 60 percent of the division's time and resources. The other 40 percent is spent on the day-to-day business of certifying teachers and regulating the approval of Oklahoma's teacher education programs.

Oklahoma Teacher Organizations

The Oklahoma Education Association (OEA), an NEA affiliate, has several members on the Oklahoma Professional Standards Board and, according to Weaver, attempts to influence teacher policy through this body. Indeed, Weaver noted that OEA members have attempted, through the legislature, to create an independent teacher standards board made up entirely of teachers. According to Weaver, this proposal has not had very much success, and therefore the OEA continues to focus on the the current advisory board as the policy body to influence (see below).

The Oklahoma State Legislature

In 1986 the Oklahoma legislature extended to twelve weeks the amount of time teachers are required to spend student teaching. The legislature has been particularly active developing policies that at least indirectly impact on teacher education. Indeed, Weaver said, "the legislature has in essence

become the real state board of education" (Weaver, 1989).

While Weaver did not discuss the implications of the state wide evaluation system on the state's teacher education programs in teacher education policy development, there does appear to be the potential that teacher education programs will be influenced by the measurement device--particularly since teacher education programs are required to participate in the evaluation process. By influence, I am suggesting that the potential exists for Oklahoma teacher education programs to construct their curricula to ensure that graduates are able to do well on the measurement process--so their graduates don't fail. It is important to report, however, that since 1985 over 7,000 teachers have been evaluated and none has failed (Weaver, 1989).

Governor Henry Belmon

Weaver reported that this first-term governor has not played a significant role in advancing issues relating to teacher education and teacher certification.

Oklahoma Department of Education, CSSO, and State Board

The state department's role has been one of implementer. The specific responsibilities are described above under the certification staff, those in the Oklahoma Department of Education charged with the implementation of the evaluation program, and the entry-year program. The department is directed by Gerald E. Hoeltzel, Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Hoeltzel, according to Weaver, has provided the legislature with good leadership in meeting the mandates, and along with the state board, has had little responsibility in initiating teacher policies in the last five years.

The Oklahoma Professional Standards Board

This board has responsibility for advising the State Board of Education on policy issues relating to professional standards, licensing, and teacher education program approval. It contains thirty five members representing all Oklahoma educational constituent groups. Weaver indicated that the size of the board creates some problems with decision making, though in the last three years the board has deferred decision making to legislative mandates.

Oklahoma Issues Summary

Oklahoma is one state in which the legislature has assumed a great deal of control and power over issues normally left to the teacher education policy process. Even in the statewide teacher evaluation plan, the legislature did not include in the development process a role for educators. The responsibility was clearly and firmly given to the state department staff. This is not to suggest that other legislatures have not had a firm hand in controlling policies, but most states have included educators in the development process, even if simply in an advisory

capacity.

Pennsylvania

In 1984-85, the Pennsylvania State Department of Education awarded $4 million to local school districts to develop efforts to improve instruction through training to sponsor new innovative programs developed by teachers and to provide financial incentives for teachers. These programs were part of former governor Richard Thornburgh's major legislative initiatives. Terry Lehr of the Pennsylvania State Department of Education indicated that "ninety percent of Pennsylvania's school districts participated in the programs" (Lehr, 1989).

When the new governor, Robert Casey, took office in 1987, the scope of the program changed to provide more funding for "promoting effective teaching." School districts were awarded extra funds to develop "mentor teacher programs" and "continuing professional development" (Lehr, 1989).

Certification Staff and Department of Education

According to Lehr, the Office of Certification and Teacher Education in the Pennsylvania Department of Education has taken on the implementation responsibility for the above noted programs. Governor Casey changed the perspective of the programs through the budget reappropriation process so as to make the funding competitive in that local school districts could apply for the funding, thus making participation optional (Lehr, 1989).

Pennsylvania Teachers Organizations

The Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA) and the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers (PFT) are the two major unions in this state. According to Lehr, the real political power of the groups is at the local level where collective bargaining occurs. In recent years the only state teacher policy issues to cause serious debate and discussion was a six-credit requirement for renewing teaching certificates. Both unions opposed the initial proposal; however, the PFT supported the master's degree exemption, while the PSEA opposed the entire six-credit requirement.

State Board of Education

The major reform policy relating to teacher education in Pennsylvania in the last five years, according to Lehr, was the state board mandate that required six course credits every five years for renewal of permanent teaching certificates.

The Pennysylvania Legislature

Lehr indicated that the legislature became the site where grievances were heard regarding the state board mandate of the six-credit requirement. The two major unions succeeded only in getting teachers with master's degrees exempted from the six-credit mandate; otherwise the mandate stood. Amazingly, this

relatively minor requirement has been the most significant teacher policy issue to come before the Pennsylvania Legislature in the last five years, again according to Lehr (1989).

Governor Robert Casey

Elected in 1986, Casey's involvment in teacher policy has only been his support for optional participation in the state's first year teacher induction program, otherwise known as the mentor teacher program. Lehr indicated that his support for the voluntary nature of the program related to funding. Lehr suggested that by making the induction program optional, the costs of the program would be less.

The State Board and the CSSO

Lehr indicated that the state board's role in teacher edcuation policy has essentially been one of "caretaker over a system largly unchanged in the last ten years." Indeed, simply mandating that teachers take an additional six credits caused serious anxiety among teachers and their unions (Lehr, 1989).

The Professional Standards Commission

This sixteen member board is appointed by the governor and advises the State Board of Education on issues relating to teacher certification. Commission members include eight teachers, two principals, one superintendent, three SCDE representatives, one student in an SCDE and one lay member. Lehr

indicated that, beginning in 1987, this board is under a "sunset review" to determine its usefulness. The NEA affiliate submitted a position paper to the State Board in 1987 to suggest giving the board more autonomy in determining teacher licensure issues and teacher preparation guidelines. Lehr reported that no action has been taken by the board thus far and it does not look like any action will be taken in the near future (Lehr, 1989).

Pennsylvania Issue Summary

While Pennsylvania has implemented several teacher programs that indirectly relate to teacher education and certification, it has been a state void of many far reaching policies. As noted above, the addition of the six-credit requirement stands as the most important change in teacher certification and teacher education--hardly a world-shaking issue.

DISCUSSION

Darling-Hammond and Berry have observed that "by sheer volume of legislation teaching has been 'reformed'" (p. 70). Tallies of teacher policies, though, do not tell the whole story about reform impulses and effects. In their inquiry into the statutes and regulations, what Darling-Hammond and Berry believed to be most evident was the acute ambivalence that many policy makers feel about the nature of teaching and the roles of teachers. I agree with this assessment. What I have come to understand is that teacher education policy often is made external to the teacher education domain--by legislatures and governors. This external pressure is in addition to the tensions within the domain of educators, advisory boards, and constituent organizations influencing the policy process and debating issues. This internal development takes time and appears ineffectual to those operating in the external political world. The certification offices staff seem to be the players on the spot where tensions are often manifested.

Tate provides a summary of the teacher education policy domain: "There is a well-defined set of issues that can be seen as belonging primarily to teacher education, and there are certain organizations and individuals in each state who regularly

seek to influence the outcome of policies related to the training of preservice teachers" (Tate, 1988).

The *de jure* control of teacher education is held by elected and appointed state officials, state legislators, state boards of education, chief state school officers and their agents (in the case of teacher education governance and certification these "agents" are part of certification office staff) and governors.

While I found examples of strong governors (Harris and Branstad), I found that most of the governors have not played an active role in proposing policy. In most instances, governors passed this responsibility on to the other policy structures. Exceptions exist in certain policy issue areas. For instance, all states have in place policies permitting the education of teachers outside a program approved either by an accreditation process of a state or a national program such as NCATE. While governors across the country are getting more and more involved in K-12 reform issues, few governors have called for reform of teacher education other than by circumventing programs attempting to ensure a measure of pedagogical competence--bypassing traditional teacher programs.

Darling-Hammond and Berry also identified an important tension that has yet to be fully played out in the current discourse of teacher education reform and its connection to the reform of K-12 education. They suggest a tension between the moral responsibility that government has in the protection of citizens against bad practice, and the freedom of teachers to be

unfettered in their pursuit of autonomy in order that they can make sound pedagogical decisions on behalf of children. What is clear from my inquiry of teacher education policymaking in eight states is that more and more decisions are being made for teachers regarding how they conduct their enterprise. Further, the policies being promulgated are often in contrast to existing licensing and preparation processes. For example, no matter how one views the Georgia program, there is strong state control over how teachers get prepared to teach and how they then conduct themselves after the preparation process. It seems unlikely that teachers or teacher educators will ever be equal partners in deciding how best to engage children in knowledge that will allow them to participate in the future of American political democracy.

There are also serious and unresolved contradictions in important policy issue areas. One example is the growth in licensure policies that circumvent teacher preparation programs altogether, as evidenced in these eight states and AACTE data. Such policies represent one of the more serious of all contradictions in the education of American teachers and there is little evidence that policy makers are willing to debate this issue.

Perhaps most troubling is the splintered nature of teacher licensure and state governance of teacher education programs. On one hand, state legislatures are the creators of state policy structures charged with the responsibility of teacher licensure

and program approval; on the other hand, legislatures have bypassed and disregarded the existing structures to expedite the implementation of other policies--namely those creating alternative paths to teacher certification, abolition of the undergraduate education major, and reductions in the number of college credits in pedagogy a teacher candidate can take in his or her preparation program.

There is no consistent pattern in the role of the players in the teacher education policy process. In one state, a strong governor is able to promote a national system of certification, while in another a governor finds that simply proposing an additional six credits to the recertification requirements poses political problems. Some states, such as California, have strong independent agencies that have greater freedom to make teacher education policy, while other states are dominated by legislative mandates. Advisory boards abound and are important for many education organizations attempting to influence teacher education policy for their own purposes, yet such bodies are often disregarded. State boards rely on state agency staff to assist with the development of teacher education policy.

There seems to be no center for the teacher education policy process. I noted early in this report that offices of certification are "switching stations" for information. This is an important role but it does not suggest that such places can provide the necesssary leadership for the improvement of teaching. The state offices are at the center of the

bureaucratic control over the licensure of teachers. Any attempt to fundamentally change teacher education will require some attention to this reality.

While I conclude that the teacher education policy domain is splintered, it does seem evident that states governing bodies are more and more assuming control over the making of teacher education policy. This implies that fewer and fewer thoughtful educators are able to influence the policy process, allowing others to fill the vacuum. This implication must be taken seriously if we continue to believe schools are also for the purpose of nurturing democratic values, for there is little democracy in shutting out those with the greatest stake in the teacher education policy process--students and their teachers and teachers in schools.

Only in Massachusetts did I find a hint of a connection between the reform of K-12 schools and the preparation of the teachers who will staff them, and in Massachusetts funding problems have virtually eliminated the possibility. Many programs exist in the states that establish mentor teachers, career ladders, and create alternative certification. However, nowhere in my review of these eight states did I find policy makers acknowledging the importance of educating teachers to be torch bearers for needed reform at the K-12 level.

Ironically, many of the reforms of the 1980s have been promoted as solutions to economic woes in the states. Robert Bellah and his colleagues warned in Habits of the Heart that

"when economics is the main model for our common life, we are more and more tempted to put ourselves in the hands of managers and the expert. If society is shattered into as many special interests as there are individuals, then, as Tocqueville foresaw, there is only the school master state left to take care of us and keep us from one another's throats" (1985, p. 271). The state role policy making in teacher education and certification does little to foster creativity, encourage experimentation, or empower others to assume responsibility for confronting the chronic problems of educating children to live and work effectively and happily in our political democracy.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. A Call For Change in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985.

_____. Teacher Education in the States: 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1988.

Bellah, Robert N. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1985.

Bull, Barry. "The Limits of Teacher Professionalism." In The Moral Dimensions of Teaching, edited by John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, 87-130. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. Who Will Teach Our Children? Sacramento: California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-first Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.

Clifford, Geraldine J., and James W. Gutherie. Ed School: A Brief for Professional Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Clinton, Bill. "The Changing Role of the Governorship." A speech delivered at the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies, Second Annual Public Policy Lecture. Nashville, Tennessee, 1988.

Cohen, Michael, Assistant Director, Education Section, National Governors Association Policy Staff. Telephone interview, 1989.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

_____. Shaping Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, and Barnett Berry. The Evolution of Teacher Policy. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation, 1988.

Dean-Barringer, Mary. Holmes Group Staff. Telephone interview, July 1989.

DiCarlo, Dennis. Project Director, Bureau of Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Placement, Massachusetts Department of Education. Telephone interview, 1989.

Earley, Penelope. Director of Policy Development and Governmental Relations, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Telephone interviews, December 1989.

Education Commission of the States. The Report of the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth: Action in the States. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1984.

Elmore, Richard F., and McLaughlin. Steady Work: Policy, Practice and the Reform of American Education. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation, 1988.

Gutmann, Amy. Democratic Education. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Hair, Donald. Executive Director, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. Telephone interview, June 1989.

Halter, Merrill. Consultant Teacher Education, Certification and Staff Development, Iowa Department of Public Instruction. Telephone interview, May 1989.

Hanner, Austin. Director of Office of Teacher Certification, State of Arkansas. Telephone interview, June 1988.

Holmes Group. A Report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group, 1986.

_____. Work in Progress: The Holmes Group One Year On. East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group, 1989.

Koff, Robert. Dean, School of Education, SUNY, Albany. Telephone interview, July 1989.

Lehr, Terry. Staff Specialist for Teacher Education, Bureau of Teacher Preparation and Certification, Pennsylvania Department of Education. Telephone interview, 1989.

Mandel, David. Vice President for Policy Development, The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Telephone interview, July 1989.

Mastain, David. Executive Director, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Telephone interview, March 1989.

McDonnell, Lorraine M. The Dilemma of Teacher Policy. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation, 1989.

McDonnell, Lorraine M., and Anthony Pascal. Teacher Unions and Educational Reform. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation, 1989.

Myers, John L. Executive Director, National Conference of State Legislatures. Telephone interview, September 1989.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Presidents 1987/88 Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1988.

_____. Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession: Initial Policies and Perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching. Washington, D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989.

National Governors' Association. Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1986.

_____. Results in Education: 1988. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1988.

_____. Getting Ready for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Assocation, 1988.

Osborne, David. Laboratories of Democracy: A New Breed of Governor Creates Models for National Growth. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1988.

Schneider, Barbara. "Tracing the Provenance of Teacher Education." In Critical Studies in Teacher Education: Its Folklore, Theory and Practice, 211-242. London: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Tate, Phillip M. "Whale or Shark? A Description of State Policy Domains for Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education 39(November, December 1988): 21-26.

Timar, Thomas B., and David L. Kirp. "Education Reform in the 1980s: Lessons from the States." 70 Phi Delta Kappan (March):504-511.

Traiman, Susan. Staff Member, National Governor's Association. Telephone interview, May 1989.

U.S. Congress, Senate. A Bill to Provide Federal assistance to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. S. 2698, 100th Congress 2d Session, 1988.

Vartolini, Lee. Staff Member, Certification Placement Section Illinois State Board of Education. Telephone interview, May 1989.

Vobejda, Barbara. "States Are Devising Alternative Programs to Train Teachers." The Washington Post, (Front Page) 22 May 1989.

Walker, John. Supervisor, Teacher Certification Unit, Colorado Department of Education. Telephone interview, May 1989.

Weaver, Joseph R. Director of Teacher Education/Testing/Staff Development, Oklahoma Department of Education. Telephone Interview, July 1989.

Wirt, Frederick M., and Michael W. Kirst. The Politics of Education: Schools in Conflict, 2d ed. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1989.

Wright, David. Coordinator, Planning and Research, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Telephone interview, April 1989.

Wyatt, Dorothy. Staff Member, Division of Teacher Certification, Georgia Department of Education. Telephone interview, May 1989.